



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2013

No. 139

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 8, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS MASSIE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### SHUTDOWN AND AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we begin the second week of the Republican government shutdown. The proximate cause was the Republican effort to delay money that the government needs to fund the Affordable Care Act, to stop the Affordable Care Act. Well, it is also now the second week of the Affordable Care Act, which clearly now will not be repealed, defunded, or delayed.

Just this last weekend, we all approved legislation that would pay all of the Federal workers on furlough the salaries they lost by being sent home making them whole. This is important because they had nothing to do with this travesty. But now, we're paying them not to work. One wonders why we're still in the middle of this exercise. Is there any way out of this cul-de-sac?

I find it encouraging that some of my Republican friends are talking about negotiating. We've been waiting for 6 months for negotiations to begin on the budget. Hopefully, Republicans will appoint conferees, and we can get down to talking about what level of spending we want, need, and can afford.

But maybe we can help things along in dealing with another area—to come together on the looming deficit of infrastructure. America's civil engineers tell us that more than \$2 trillion is needed over the next 5 years for roads, bridges, transit, sewer, and water. These deficiencies create uncertainty, congestion, safety, and health problems, and undercut America's long-term productivity. Why don't we come together to address this problem? Ronald Reagan supported a nickel-a-gallon gas tax increase in 1982, when that was real money. The Clinton plan that led to our only balanced budgets in 40 years included our last gas tax increase. And remember the Simpson-Bowles deficit plan that called for a phased-in gas tax increase of 15 cents?

Since the last increase in the gas tax, the purchasing power of the highway trust fund has dropped by two-thirds due to inflation and greater vehicle efficiency. If we want to bring Americans together, let's work with the huge coalition that stands ready to work with Congress in taking this action. It includes people in the construction industry, obviously, but also local governments and professions like architects and engineers, truckers, and

bicyclists. Everyone from the AFL-CIO to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce acknowledges that it is past time for Congress to act, and they will work with us if we take action.

The failure to address this loss of purchasing power is also a source of the budget deficit. Since the last big transportation bill expired in 2005, we have had to make four major general fund transfers of approximately \$50 billion just to prop it up at its current inadequate level, and it's going to get worse when the transportation bill expires in 51 weeks.

I urge my colleagues to join me in averting another fiscal cliff, this one with the highway trust fund. Let's work with the vast array of interests that want to rebuild and renew America. Don't ignore this deficit. Instead, let's act responsibly in fixing the trust fund, putting hundreds of thousands of Americans to work at family wage jobs, in rebuilding and renewing America's infrastructure—making us safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

### DOING THE PEOPLE'S WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, just because the President and Senate refuse to talk to the House of Representatives doesn't mean we're going to stop doing the people's work. We will continue to make the case that there is no rational or acceptable reason for the President and Senate to deny working families fair treatment under ObamaCare.

Just as the President decided to give big businesses 1 year to ready themselves for all of the ObamaCare's drastic changes, the American people should have that same year. It is basic fairness.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6345

And while the Senate refuses to work with us to work through our policy differences to reopen government fully, the House of Representatives will continue building common ground with House Democrats to restore as many services as we possibly can. The Senate should consider these proposals—opening parks, funding the NIH, ending veteran benefits application delays, funding FEMA and the FDA, and restoring WIC. They are things we can agree on. Let's not squander these opportunities for common ground. Let's pass policies we can agree on and work through our differences together. Regardless of the Senate's non-negotiation policies, North Carolinians still deserve to have their voices heard at their Capitol.

My constituent Jeremiah from Rural Hall just received a letter from his insurance provider. He tells me:

It appears that due to the health care reform, my insurance premium will double for the upcoming year. It also appears that there's nothing I can change with my current insurance provider to make it more affordable. I have been attempting to log onto the President's Web site, [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov), without success. I understand that I may be able to get a tax credit if I'm eligible. To my understanding, this will not help me in making my month-to-month bills. If this change goes through next year, I'll not be able to afford to feed my children, much less purchase health insurance. This needs to stop now.

Angie from Clemmons contacted me to say:

ObamaCare is already adversely affecting my family in several ways. My son and daughter-in-law's family health policies are rising dramatically. They both are already working full-time jobs, and each one has part-time work also.

Robert from Lewisville wrote:

My 27-year-old son, David, buys health care insurance through Blue Cross/Blue Shield of North Carolina. His current cost is \$111 per month. He received a letter from Blue Cross saying his current policy is being canceled due to the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare. David's new cost is going to be \$288 per month. He works hard and does not take handouts from government. How is ObamaCare helping people like him?

Jeffrey from Boonville told me his story, too:

I went onto the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Web site this morning. If I buy health insurance today, the cost would be \$256 a month, but come the first of the year, the same plan will be \$556 a month. How is that affordable? This new law was supposed to make it more affordable. I've not checked yet to see if I can get a subsidy. Even if I was eligible for one, it's not the responsibility of other Americans to subsidize my family's health insurance.

Susan from Mocksville wrote to me to say:

I had affordable health care. I paid Blue Cross/Blue Shield of North Carolina \$181 per month. Now they sent a letter saying that if I keep this insurance, it will now be \$464 per month. This is insane. ObamaCare is affordable for who? Please, who can I contact to have some kind of influence?

Mr. Speaker, we share Susan's concerns in the House of Representatives. We want Susan to be treated fairly and to have the same 1-year break from

ObamaCare that President Obama chose to give to Big Business. And on Susan's behalf, House Republicans are trying to contact a body with some influence, the United States Senate, to find a way to reopen government and ensure ObamaCare is implemented fairly. But the Senate isn't willing to budge. They won't sit down to talk. They are not interested in making sure the President's unworkable law is at least applied fairly.

#### GETTING BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, just days before the United States Government reaches its statutory borrowing limit, let's be clear: this is not new spending. This is agreeing to pay the bills we've already accrued. Senator Alan Simpson said it best:

If you're a real conservative, an honest conservative without hypocrisy, you'd want to pay your debt.

Eight days ago, a minority faction of the Congress chose to shut down the Federal Government. This was touching the fire. To refuse to lift the debt ceiling is to place our entire hand into the fire. A Reagan economist called this debate "playing with matches around gasoline." Yes, that's the same President Ronald Reagan who raised the debt ceiling 18 times without the accompanying brinksmanship. And let's remember, during the 2011 debt ceiling debate, the mere threat of a default scared the markets and drove up interest rates. Retirees lost \$800 billion in assets as markets tumbled. Home buyers lost \$100 a month as rates spiked. The harm this time could be much worse.

We need to pay our bills so we can start solving the real problems facing this country rather than fixing ones we caused ourselves. And, Mr. Speaker, what is most extraordinary about this fiasco is this: I thought budget negotiations were supposed to be about funding levels, but this Nation's most contentious budget fight in nearly 20 years isn't about funding levels at all; it's about using the budget as leverage to repeal or delay an existing law.

Despite the destructive effects of sequestration, in an effort to compromise, we gave in to the demands to the majority and accepted their \$986 billion spending limit. Just put this into context. The \$986 billion level is 17 percent below fiscal year 2010 spending and 10 percent less than the original Ryan budget. It is below Simpson-Bowles. If that's not compromise, I don't know what is. Those on the other side of this aisle don't know how to take "yes" for an answer. We agreed to deeply slash government spending. Please accept a victory and restart the government so we can get back to the real work of this body.

#### THE SHIELD ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again this morning to thank the men and women of the Federal law enforcement community, as well as those brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, for what they do to protect this great Nation both abroad and here at home.

Certainly, we are thankful for them each and every day for protecting us in our Nation, but recent events again remind us of their importance.

After the Capitol was thrown into lock-down last week, Capitol Police and other Federal officers sprang into action to protect the building and those inside. In their rush to service, I'm sure none of them thought about the fact that as we continue in a partial government shutdown that they may not be paid even though, for some, that may have been the case.

While there is uncertainty about the Nation's fiscal path in Washington, that uncertainty should never be passed along to our servicemembers and Federal law enforcement officers. The Strengthening Homeland Security, Intelligence, and Essential Law Enforcement Departments Act, or SHIELD Act, of 2013 would alleviate that doubt. This simple, bipartisan legislation that I have introduced prioritizes and protects pay for soldiers and law enforcement personnel if borrowing limits are reached or if there is an interruption in appropriations like there is right now.

In our most difficult hours, we rely on our law enforcement officers and our military for the protection of our lives, liberty, and freedom. No servicemember or critical officer protecting the United States at home or abroad should have to worry about their paychecks in the event of a government shutdown, nor should they be used as a bargaining chip during partisan budget debates. Thankfully, during this current budget impasse, pay for our troops was secured early through a bipartisan vote, and I applaud the President for agreeing to it. However, the SHIELD Act would codify the measure into law, meaning paychecks would never again be threatened, and action would never have to be taken to protect this very basic principle.

□ 1015

This bill already has the strong support of organizations like the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, which represents dedicated first responders. Just as important, it is commonsense legislation that everyday Americans understand and expect from a Congress that often stumbles in its responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to the brave men and women who protect us—both abroad and in your communities—to make sure their pay doesn't become a

political pawn at the whim of battling ideologies.

No members of our Federal law enforcement community or armed services should have to worry about the financial situation of their family back home while they are on the job; nor should we let our financial problems rest on the backs of those who selflessly serve the American people.

By ensuring funding for critical Federal officers and our troops, we are allowing agencies and departments to sustain a strong law enforcement and military presence at all times, regardless of fiscal conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this commonsense, bipartisan legislation, and I call for leadership in both parties to consider the SHIELD Act for quick passage.

#### GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is day 7 in a bizarre, new twist on the Republican Tea Party trip down the rabbit hole. On Saturday, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to pay retroactively every Federal employee, those who are working, Capitol Hill Police, those who are being kept from working, like the aviation safety inspector I talked with yesterday. He was quite concerned about what might happen with a long lapse in aviation safety nonpartisans, but he's not allowed to work. That's a bit bizarre. He's thankful that he will someday be paid for not working, but he would rather be working, actually.

How is it in this weird world that the Mad Hatter Tea Party explains to their people back home, Well, we've shut down government sorta. We've shut down the services, but we're going to pay people for the work they're not doing. We're going to let the Social Security applications pile up and not be processed. We're going to lock people out of the national wildlife refuges during hunting season. We're going to keep the crabbing fleet grounded in Alaska because we can't issue their permits, and we're not going to continue to do the surveys for the fishing season off the northwest coast.

We've withdrawn all of that. All of those people are sitting around at home, frustrated by law, can't even access their official email, but they're going to be paid. And the Republicans say, We made it good. We're going to pay them.

What about the American people getting the services?

It reminds me of Wimpy J. Wellington from Popeye, who says, I'll gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today. Somehow, Tuesday never came, and repayment was never made. In this case, perhaps someday, when they stop their games, we will repay people. But what about the people who have automatic withdrawals, and

they're living paycheck to paycheck, and their mortgage is coming due today or next week? What are they going to do? I see the credit unions offering zero percent loans. That's very nice of them. Wouldn't it be better if we actually put those people back to work and we paid them, and you declared victory?

You have victory within your grasp, and you're refusing it. Is it about ObamaCare? You know that was an impossible goal. That victory is not within your grasp. If it's about the deficit, which is what Gingrich put the government out of work for, then you have victory within your grasp, because Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader REID agreed weeks ago to a 6-week continuing resolution, which is what has customarily been done around here for the 27 years I've been here when the two bodies can't agree on a budget. We don't shut down the government every year. Out of 27 years, twice have we got it done in time. So in 23 of those cases, we've continued. In this case, Senator REID agreed to continue running the government at lower levels of spending, a major reduction back below the 2010 levels. All Speaker BOEHNER has to do is bring that bill to the floor of the House, and it will pass.

There are enough Republicans who told the press that they would vote for that. They can declare victory. They cut the budget yet again. They're not off on this fruitless errand of trying to stop ObamaCare from going into effect, which went into effect last week. By the way, 234,000 Oregonians have accessed our Oregon Web site, which is working quite well, thank you very much. In the States that are cooperating, it's working well. In those bone-head States that said they wouldn't cooperate and wouldn't help their people and are actually prohibiting people from being helped like, Florida, no, it's not working so well. I wonder why. Go figure.

Let's not continue this, and let's begin to deal very quickly with the issues before us because we have looming a deadline that you can't make good later. You can't make it good later. You can't tell the people of the world, all those to whom we owe hundreds of billions of dollars and the Social Security trust fund and others, Oh, we'll make it good later after we default on the debt someday. Interest rates will jump up; houses become more expensive; the housing market probably crashes again; auto sales grind to a halt; credit card interest rates go to even more extortion levels. The damage you will do by credibly threatening to default on the debt of the United States of America for some clearly undefined goal will not be undone for generations. You can't go there.

Declare victory temporarily. You got your lower levels. Bring a bill to the floor today. Let us vote on it. The Speaker said on the weekend he doesn't have the votes. Let's check that out,

because we really think he does have the votes; and it's making him not look too good that he actually accepted the deal before he rejected it and now says he doesn't have the votes. That's an interesting kind of conundrum, and we can prove it very easily.

Bring the bill up today. Fund the government. Pay people to actually work.

#### WORDS HAVE MEANING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, words have meaning, and we are coming to the floor regularly to talk about the fiscal issues of our great Nation and to talk about how we should approach these.

I'd appreciate that we have everyone in the body involved in this debate, Mr. Speaker, but I want to drill down just a little bit and take a look at what we have going on out in the media and what we continue to hear from so many who are beginning to participate in this debate.

The President and some of our friends across the aisle love saying they want a clean CR. That sounds really nice. For them, they feel as if it implies that what we want is a dirty or an unclean or an evil CR, and I find their choice of words so very interesting, Mr. Speaker.

What we want is an accountable CR because, when they're saying they want a clean CR, I would encourage my colleagues to realize what they're wanting is the no-obligation loan. They want no strings attached. A "clean CR" means give us the money, but don't you dare expect us to be accountable for that money.

Words have meaning. When our colleagues hear that, I would encourage them to just realize that what they're really telling you is that they don't want the accountability, that they don't want the transparency. They do not want the responsibility. As we would say when I was in the State Senate in Tennessee, they don't want outcome-based budgeting; they just want to be able to spin what they can spin.

What we continue to push for is accountability, transparency, being responsible to the taxpayer and being responsible to future generations. We have to do that because the spending is out of control.

We talk a lot about the CR and the lower spending levels that are in that. Those came about because of the Budget Control Act. The fact is that we worked and got a 2 percent across-the-board spending reduction; and for the last 2 years we've been able to get the deficit, the annual spending overage, down a little bit. We were in 2010 and 2011 borrowing \$3 billion a day to keep the doors open around here. Today, we're borrowing \$2 billion per day to keep the doors open. We need to get to

the point that we're not borrowing a single cent. We need to get to that point. Our goal, for those on the other side who can't figure out what a goal is, our goal is fiscal responsibility, fiscal endurance and sovereignty, preserving freedom, free people and free markets. That is our goal for this Nation and doing it in a responsible way.

I've got a great niece who is due this month, and when Georgia Kati Graham arrives, I don't want her to be looking at a mess of a Federal Government. Right now, her share of the national debt is \$53,000. Every newborn who is going to arrive: welcome. With your citizenship, here is what you owe.

That is not responsible. It is why we come to this floor day after day. It is why we continue to say to the Senate, Negotiate with us. Work with us. Sure, let's look at the short-term funding issues, let's look at the long run. How do we preserve this great Nation? How do we get this spending under control? I would offer, Mr. Speaker, we don't do it by going out and borrowing \$2 billion a day. We don't do it by having the Fed monetize \$75 billion worth of debt each and every month. We do it by saying we don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem. And it is time that we put the components of that problem on the table and negotiate our way through it so that we're looking at long-term fiscal health and fiscal solvency, not just for this year or next year, not just for the next decade, but for the next century. Let's put our focus on how we return to certainty, how we return to predictability with our Federal regulatory agencies and our Tax Code.

The time to tackle the problem is now.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

#### AMERICAN NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the three recipients of the Nobel Prize in medicine for 2013. All three work at American universities.

Dr. James E. Rothman chairs the cell biology department at Yale University. Dr. Randy W. Schekman works at the University of California at Berkeley. Their German counterpart, Dr. Thomas C. Sudhof, is on the faculty of Stanford.

The Nobel committee has recognized the importance of their lifesaving work. The question is: Why don't the House Republicans?

On the very day that three researchers at American universities won the

Nobel Prize in medicine, the House Republicans continue their siege against the Government of the United States, and their siege includes the National Institutes of Health, where the American people through their Federal Government support medical research and path-breaking, basic research in the difficult search for cures.

Mr. Speaker, I should note that Dr. Rothman of Yale received two grants under the Obama Recovery Act for his work in developing a better way to study cells. Of course, he would have received none if the Republicans in Congress had had their way. More to the point, the Republican shutdown has jeopardized hundreds of research projects like Dr. Rothman's, Dr. Schekman's and Dr. Sudhof's. The Republicans have essentially shut down the National Institutes of Health, which has told researchers that they cannot process their grant applications, which eventually will bring federally supported research to a halt.

I count more than 30 research projects underway just in Ohio at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland and at least a dozen more at the Cleveland Clinic and at the University of Toledo Medical University—cutting-edge research, peer-reviewed research, research that could save lives.

Thanks to the Republican Congress, these are "dark days for medical research." So says the Atlantic Magazine.

Between the sequester and the shutdown, repeated hits to research funding may have serious consequences for scientific advancement.

That's not something you see in the flash of but one day. But it erodes America's real strength over time.

□ 1030

Almost three out of four employees at the National Institutes of Health are sitting at home, thanks to the Republican Congress. They're not allowed to do their work of finding cures and stamping out disease. The Republican Congress locked them out. Two hundred patients at the National Institutes of Health Clinical Center were turned away due to the Republican Congress' throwing its little temper tantrum over losing the Presidential election again. Many of those 200 people are cancer patients, and 30 of them are children, paying a heavy, heavy price for Republican intransigence. The Republicans told them, Go away.

Mr. Speaker, even if the Republicans lack any empathy whatsoever, at least you would think they would care about jobs in America. Research and development, including research and development in biotechnology, provides a competitive advantage for the United States. It's a very promising sector for economic development and job growth. Just come to Cleveland to see the new Health Innovation Center, or look at the neuropsychiatric research being conducted at Case and the University of Toledo Medical Center. Look at

what it draws around it. Yet The Atlantic magazine says the sequester is killing 20,500 jobs this year in the life sciences field, and the government shutdown threatens to ground medical research into cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes, and disabling neuropsychiatric disorders.

The Nobel committee gets it. The American people get it. A recent poll showed that 83 percent of the public believes investing in medical research is important for our economy.

So why don't the Republicans get it? As NIH Director Collins told The Atlantic last week:

We will not know what grant that was going to lead to the next breakthrough in cancer research didn't quite make the cut. We will not know what brilliant scientists, who were going to win a Nobel Prize, basically gave up because of the failure to get support from the current system and decided to do something else or move to another country, which some of them are doing already. We won't know. That is the sad tale that is wrapped up in all of this.

The good news is that three scientists working on the frontier of scientific research—three scientists at American universities—did not give up, and they have captured the Nobel Prize in Medicine for 2013.

The bad news is that House Republicans apparently have given up. They apparently don't care whether the U.S. keeps distinguishing itself by winning such prestigious awards. They apparently don't care whether we support the research that will help humankind and eliminate diseases and save lives. They don't care if the United States remains the global leader in medical and scientific research and enjoys the millions of jobs that it will create in the future—what a shame—and how easy it would be to bring up a clean continuing resolution and put the government of the people of this country back to work.

#### ATF CENSORS FREE SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to talk and discuss and debate the issues of the debt ceiling, of the continuing resolution, there are still things taking place in government. Some of them aren't so good.

Just to give a little background, which you are certainly aware of, we have our Constitution with the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is a section in the Constitution that protects citizens from government abuses.

The First Amendment is first because it contains the most important rights. If those rights are abridged, the rest of the Bill of Rights—to me—is meaningless, and we all know that two of those provisions have to do with the freedom of speech and the freedom of press. We traditionally honor those because they are so important.

Historically, the most controversial of all speech and press was political

speech and religious speech. Those are especially protected in the First Amendment, and there are historical reasons for that. The colonists, our forefathers, they were an ornery bunch, and they were constantly hammering, through the press and through speech, King George III, Great Britain, and their abuses on individuals in the Colonies—and rightfully so.

Therefore, when our Constitution was written and the Bill of Rights was written, we wanted to ensure that, under our philosophy and under our democracy in the United States, freedom of speech, and freedom of press were protected.

Over the years, the Supreme Court has ruled on free speech and press cases; but they have gradually limited speech, which is another issue. The prevailing rule is that, if there's a compelling State interest—whatever that means—and we'll talk about that some other time—then speech can be prohibited. Never mind, Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment doesn't say anything about limiting speech when there's a compelling State interest.

But the Supreme Court said, if there's a compelling State interest, speech can be limited, and, of course, the Supreme Court decides what that compelling State interest is.

There are also two types of punishment for speech. One is censorship, which is the most egregious. That is to prevent someone from saying something or publishing something. Then there's the other type of punishment for speech, after the speech is made. Then there is punishment sometimes for what is said, such as a threat or yelling "fire" in a crowded theater. But the most egregious is preventing someone from saying something or printing something or publishing something. That is censorship.

So that brings us to what is taking place. We've all heard of Fast and Furious. That's the situation where our government sent guns to Mexico under the theory that they're going to track the guns. Americans were killed; Mexican nationals were killed. We're over in court because Eric Holder won't give us information about Fast and Furious. Now one of the ATF agents wants to publish a book, called, "The Unarmed Truth," and it's about Fast and Furious. He is an agent in the ATF and whistleblower.

The ATF has a policy that says, Well, we, the ATF, decide whether someone in our organization is allowed to publish or have some type of outside employment, and we use our own discretion. It's just up to us. We don't have any policy rules. We just arbitrarily decide. And they have decided that because Dodson wants to publish this on his own time, not on company time, or government time—he went and tried to get permission—they said, You can't publish that book. Here's the reason he was given, Mr. Speaker. The reason given to him was, well, it might hurt the morale in the ATF.

Now, do you think that's a compelling State interest to prevent a person from printing something and violating his right of free speech because the government says it might hurt the morale in the ATF?

Absolutely not. You've got somebody that wants to tell the truth about the ATF, and it's a violation of his constitutional right not to be able to discuss openly what took place. It's a denial of the First Amendment freedom of speech. It is a denial of freedom of press.

These individuals of the ATF, censor police, ought to be furloughed. They ought to be sequestered, specifically those that are denying the freedom of press, the freedom of speech to someone who just wants to talk about what took place in the ATF. This ought not to be, but that's what has taken place by the ATF coverup squad. Unchain the freedom of speech and press.

And that's just the way it is.

#### DEBT CEILING INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the irresponsibility of the Republican Party in holding hostage the full faith and credit of the United States.

As hundreds of thousands of Federal workers go without pay, as home buying slows to an eventual halt, and as Federal agencies remain unable to complete the important work of implementing the Wall Street Reform Act, Republicans are threatening another crisis that could have significant impacts on our financial markets and the economic security of all Americans. They do this in pursuit of an ideological agenda. The result is continued instability and uncertainty for our economy and fragile recovery.

We should not default on our obligations. The ramifications of doing so would be serious. The underpinnings of the entire financial system could be affected, with the possibility of triggering a financial crisis reminiscent of the days following the failure of Lehman Brothers—only this time, it would be far worse.

If the U.S. defaults on its debt, lending—the lifeblood of our economy—would dry up. The dollar's value could drop, and we could see dramatic increases in interest rates on everything from mortgages and auto loans to credit cards. Not only that, but every U.S. corporation and municipality would likely see their borrowing costs climb as well. Unemployment rates would rise precipitously just as we're beginning to recover.

If Congress cannot do its job in a timely manner, in the future, the government's ability to pay its debts will be looked upon with uncertainty by investors and markets, leading to higher borrowing costs in the future and, in turn, an increase in our Nation's def-

icit. Worst of all, we could see another dramatic loss of wealth for working Americans.

History tells us that even the threat of default can send shock waves through our financial system. In 2011, just the prospect of defaulting on our debt caused a drop in consumer and business confidence, a 17 percent decline in the S&P 500 index of equity prices, and increased volatility in the stock market; and, of course, we received a downgrade in the U.S. Government debt.

The drop in equity caused by the 2011 debt ceiling fight had serious consequences for American families. The months following saw a \$2.4 trillion decline in household wealth and an \$800 billion drop in retirement assets. The cost of homeownership also increased, as risk-averse lenders increased the cost of borrowing to purchase a home. The 2011 debate showed us the very serious consequences of even debating whether we should pay bills already incurred.

But no one knows with certainty the full extent of the damage to the economy should the U.S. actually default on its debts. We have heard speculation ranging from bad to the catastrophic. I, for one, do not want to find out.

What I do know is that everyone from Wall Street CEOs, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, to small business owners, and prominent conservative economists are concerned with the significant damage that could result from a debt ceiling standoff. Warren Buffett, Ben Bernanke, Hank Paulson, and the heads of the Nation's largest financial institutions have been outspoken about the need to end this hostage crisis now.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have been through enough. We remain in the midst of a government shutdown with no end in sight. It is hurting real people and damaging our economic recovery. At this tenuous time, defaulting on our Nation's debt could create the perfect storm that may roil financial markets and undermine the credibility of the United States; but, most importantly, it could be devastating for American families who are already suffering in the aftermath of a major recession, foreclosure crisis, and now a government shutdown.

So I urge my colleagues to stop using the debt ceiling to push extremist ideology and vote now on a clean debt limit increase.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee said she doesn't know what we mean when we talk about a "clean debt limit increase." I think she knows. She knows that they should not try to do away with the ACA—that is, the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare—and hold us hostage because they don't like it.

The ObamaCare legislation was passed. It is in law. President Obama was absolutely supported by the citizens of this country when they voted the President to be reelected once again. The Supreme Court supported it.

If they wish to do away with ObamaCare, they should go through the legislative process and repeal it; but no, they are holding us hostage on the budget.

#### BLIZZARD IN SOUTH DAKOTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, a record blizzard hit my State of South Dakota. Some places in the Black Hills saw almost 4 feet of snow in just 2 days. Thousands were without power. Thousands are still without power. Emergency vehicles were stranded along with the people that they were trying to rescue.

The damage from the downed trees, the downed power lines covered with heavy, wet snow is monumental. On top of that, with warm weather expected this week, we expect to see massive flooding that could bring even more damage.

On the plains in western South Dakota, ranchers are still trying to recover from losing cattle in the drought last summer, which was the worst drought that we had seen since the Great Depression.

□ 1045

We've heard now that they've lost tens of thousands of cattle in this fall blizzard. We've heard that tens of thousands of cattle have been lost in the snow. They're being found frozen, smothered by the high drifts and injured from wandering in zero visibility in 70-mile-per-hour winds.

We talked with one rancher near White River, South Dakota, who found over 50 cattle who had died in one spot near a dam.

Another rancher north of New Underwood was finally able to locate his entire herd of 63 cows who'd taken refuge in a shed for protection, but none of them survived.

Another story is from a rancher near Union Center who said, "It's bad. It's really bad. I'm the eternal optimist, but this is really bad. The livestock loss is catastrophic. It's pretty unbelievable."

He said cattle were soaked by 12 hours of rain early in the storm, so many were unable to survive an additional 48 hours of snow and winds up to 60 miles per hour.

See, this blizzard came so early, cattle hadn't even had time to grow their winter coats. "It's the worst early season snowstorm I've seen in my lifetime," he said, and he's 60 years old.

Another rancher said, "This is absolutely, totally devastating." He's 52 years old. He's from Caputa, South Dakota. "This is horrendous. I mean the death loss of these cows in this country is unbelievable."

This man said he estimated he had lost half of his herd, but it could be far more. He was still struggling to find

snow-buried cattle and those that had been pushed miles by winds that gusted over 70 miles per hour on Friday night.

An emergency management director in Butte County said that the trail of carcasses is a gruesome sight across the region. They're in the fence line. They're laying along the roads. It's really sickening.

And none of the ranchers that I have talked to can remember anything like it. Not only will this be devastating for this year's business, but also it will take years to rebuild what has been lost.

Yet another rancher, near Scenic, couldn't find his cattle over the weekend, and said he nearly killed a horse trying to get through the snow while searching for his cattle. He turned back, and yesterday, with the help of a pilot friend, flew over land south of the Badlands.

He found what he called the "trail of death." About 200 of his 600 cows were dead, leading up to and throughout a draw. The calves that were still alive were standing by their mothers. The rest of his cows and calves are alive, but he can't get to them.

Those are just many of the tragic stories that we've heard. Our lack of a comprehensive farm bill leaves these ranchers without the protection of a livestock disaster program that would come in in these situations and blunt just a small portion of the loss.

I fought hard to include livestock disaster programs in the farm bill, which would cover these producers retroactively.

It's time we finish our work on the farm bill. It's time we go to conference, have a negotiation on the most reform-minded farm bill that has been put together for decades. Getting the farm bill done could give those in western South Dakota more certainty during this very, very difficult time.

#### THE ISSUE THAT WILL NOT GO AWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detract our attention from the current national debate on the government shutdown and the debt ceiling issue, but I do want to share with my colleagues an issue that will not go away.

What is it that the National Football League, the 32 football club owners, and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell have yet to understand why the word "redskin" is considered a very offensive racial and derogatory term that describes Native American Indians?

My apologies, Mr. Speaker, for I have yet to master the English language. But I want to share again and again with my colleagues and some 181 million football fans all over America why our Native American Indian community considers the word "redskin" as

very offensive, and clearly, the National Football League and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell cannot and should not disclaim responsibility.

Again, let's review the history. The origin of the term "redskin" is commonly attributed to the colonial practice of trading Native American Indian scalps and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1755, settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Province were paid out of the public treasury for the killing and scalping of people of the Penobscot tribe. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps, I submit, Mr. Speaker, were called "redskins."

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared that the word "redskin" is "not just a racial slur or a derogatory term," but a painful "reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of . . . ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people."

Mr. Speaker, again, I ask my colleagues and the 181 million football fans throughout this great Nation of ours—suppose that that redskins scalp that was brought in for payment was the scalp of your mother, your daughter, or your wife or your son? Again, Mr. Speaker, Native American Indians are also human beings and God's children. They are not animals.

Our colleague, TOM COLE, from Oklahoma, the cochair of our Congressional Native American Indian Caucus and a member of the Chickasaw Nation, states:

This is the 21st century. This is the capital of political correctness on the planet. It is very, very, very offensive. This isn't like warriors or chiefs. It's not a term of respect, and it's needlessly offensive to a large part of our population. They just don't happen to live around Washington, D.C.

Also, our colleague BETTY MCCOLLUM from Minnesota, as cochair of the Congressional Native American Indian Caucus, says this "is another attempt to justify a racial slur on behalf of Mr. Dan Snyder," the owner of the Washington franchise, "and other NFL owners who appear to be only concerned with earning even larger profits, even if it means exploiting a racist stereotype of Native Americans. For the head of a multibillion dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that 'redskin' actually 'stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect,' is a statement of absurdity."

My dear friend and colleague, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, representing the District of Columbia, states that the owner of the Washington football franchise, Mr. Dan Snyder, "is a man who has shown sensibilities based on his own ethnic identity, yet who refuses to recognize the sensibilities of American Indians."



Ms. NORTON also said:

As an African American woman and third-generation Washingtonian, I want to say to Redskins fans, no one blames you for using a name that has always been used . . . but I can think of no argument for retaining a name that degrades our first Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the game of American football has become one of the most treasured sports among American Polynesian athletes. Polynesian youth learn to play the sport at a young age, with dreams of playing in the National Football League. Football offers opportunities for higher education and economic opportunity.

Many of our Polynesian NFL players have realized their dreams, like Troy Polumalu, and Chris Kemoatu of the Pittsburgh Steelers, the late Junior Seau, and now Manti Te'o of the San Diego Chargers, and the former player, Joe Salave'a, and Roy Helu, with the Washington Redskins.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, let's do the right thing, and I appeal to the NFL, do the right thing. Change the name of the Washington football franchise.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detract our attention from the current national debate on the government shutdown and the debt ceiling issue, but I want to share with my colleagues an issue that just will not go away. What is it that the National Football League, the 32 football club owners, and the NFL Commissioner Mr. Roger Goodell have yet to understand why the word "redskin" is considered a very offensive, racial and derogatory term that describes Native American Indians?

My apologies, Mr. Speaker, for I have not yet mastered the English language—but I want to share again, and again with my colleagues and some 181 million football fans around the country—why our Native American Indian community considers the word "redskin" as very offensive, and clearly the National Football League, and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell cannot and should not disclaim responsibility.

Again, let's review the history. The origin of the term "redskin" is commonly attributed to the colonial practice of trading Native American Indian scalps and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1755, settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Province were paid out of the public treasury for killing and scalping people of the Penobscot tribe. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds, while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps were called "redskins."

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared that "redskins" is "not just a racial slur or a derogatory term," but a painful "reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of . . . ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people."

Mr. Speaker, again I ask my colleagues and the 181 million football fans throughout this great Nation of ours—suppose that the "redskin" scalp that was brought in for payment was the scalp of your mother, your daughter, or your wife or son? Again, Mr. Speaker, Native American Indians are also human beings and God's children—they are not animals!

Our colleague TOM COLE from Oklahoma, Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Indian Caucus, and a member of the Chikassaw Nation, states: "This is the 21st century. This is the capital of political correctness on the planet. It is very, very, very offensive. This isn't like warriors or chiefs. It's not a term of respect, and it's needlessly offensive to a large part of our population. They just don't happen to live around Washington, DC."

Also, our colleague BETTY MCCOLLUM from Minnesota and Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Indian Caucus, states that Mr. Goodell's letter "is another attempt to justify a racial slur on behalf of [Mr.] Dan Snyder," owner of the Washington franchise, "and other NFL owners who appear to be only concerned with earning even larger profits, even if it means exploiting a racist stereotype of Native Americans. For the head of a multi-billion dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that '[r]edskin' actually 'stands for strength, courage pride, and respect' is a statement of absurdity."

My dear friend and colleague, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, representing the District of Columbia, states that the owner of the Washington football franchise Mr. Daniel Snyder "is a man who has shown sensibilities based on his own ethnic identity, [yet] who refuses to recognize the sensibilities of American Indians." Ms. Norton also said, "As an African American woman and third-generation Washingtonian, I want to say to Redskins fans—no one blames you for using a name that has always been used . . . but I can think of no argument for retaining a name that degrades our first Americans."

Mr. Speaker, the game of American football has become one of the most treasured sports among American Polynesian athletes. Polynesian youth learn to play the sport at a young age with dreams of playing in the National Football League. Football offers an opportunity to enter the realm of higher education and economic opportunity. Many of our Polynesian NFL players have realized their dreams—like Troy Polumalu and former player Chris Kemoatu of the Pittsburgh Steelers, the late Junior Seau and now Manti Te'o of the San Diego Chargers, former player Joe Salave'a and now Roy Helu, Jr. with the Washington "Redskins," Haloti Ngata and former player Ma'ake Kemoatu with the Baltimore Ravens, Isaac Sopoaga and former player Vai Sikaheima with the Philadelphia Eagles, Tyson Alualu with the Jacksonville Jaguars, Samson Satele and Fill Moala with the Indianapolis Colts, Mike Iupati with the San Francisco 49ers, Ropati Pitoitua with the Tennessee Titans, Paul Soliai with the Miami Dolphins, and Domato Peko, Ray Mauluga, and former player Jonathan Fanene with the Cincinnati Bengals, and the list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I love the game of football. I played all four years in high school. I love the NFL. But there is absolutely no excuse for the Washington professional football franchise to continue the shameful use of the word "redskins."

Just last week, another island boy weighed in on the name of the Washington, DC football franchise. He is none other than our own President Barack Obama, born in Hawaii and who played basketball for Punahou High School in Honolulu, Hawaii, and he said: "If I were the owner of the team and I knew that

the name of my team—even if they've had a storied history—was offending a sizable group of people, I'd think about changing it." President Obama further said: "Native Americans feel pretty strongly about it . . . I don't know whether our attachment to a particular name should override the real, legitimate concerns that people have about these things."

While race-based killing of Native Americans is a thing of the past, the tradition of mockery and insult—whether intentional or not—lives on through the Washington "Redskins," a name that American Indian rights activist Ms. Suzan Harjo calls "the worst thing in the English language you can be called if you are a native person." This is not a popularity contest. You don't take polls on issues with deep moral implications. That is just absolute nonsense.

For those who question whether this racist or derogatory word is offensive to Native Americans, I want to share with my colleagues an excerpt from a letter sent by the leaders and members of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI)—the oldest, largest, and most representative American Indian and Alaska Native organization serving the broad interests of the majority of some 5 million Native Americans with well over 500 tribal governments and communities across the nation. In the letter, NCAI President Jefferson Keel of the Chikassaw Nation from Oklahoma states that Congressional efforts on this issue "will accomplish what Native American people, nations, and organizations have tried to do in the courts for almost twenty years—end the racist epithet that has served as the [name] of Washington's pro football franchise for far too long."

Mr. Speaker, the term "redskin" does not, as NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell suggests, offend just one person. And the responsibility for perpetuating this racial slur, as Mr. Goodell implies, lies not just with Mr. Dan Snyder, the owner of the Washington football franchise. The responsibility rests squarely on the National Football League and the 32 owners of their football teams, and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell.

As for the "Redskins" sponsors—such as FedEx, Virginia Lottery, Sprint Nextel, Coca-Cola, Bank of America, Anheuser-Busch, and others—they are equally accountable for the continued use of this disparaging term. Their silence on the issue given their direct contribution to this racist and derogatory word is deafening.

Again, I ask NFL Commissioner Goodell and the 32 club owners—do the right thing—change the name of the Washington football franchise.

I submit for the record a letter from the National Congress of American Indians; and today's commentary from two articles in the Washington Post authored by Mr. Dana Milbank, Ms. Theresa Vargas and Mr. Mark Maske.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF  
AMERICAN INDIANS,  
March 21, 2013.

Hon. ENI FALEOMAVAEGA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FALEOMAVAEGA: On behalf of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), the nation's oldest and largest tribal government advocacy organization in the country, we applaud you for sponsoring the "Non-Disparagement of Native

American Persons or People in Trademark Registration Act of 2013". This legislation will accomplish what Native American people, nations, and organizations have tried to do in the courts for almost twenty years—end the racist epithet that has served as the mascot of Washington's pro football franchise for far too long.

The NCAI membership has been an active part of ending these types of derogatory stereotypes for several decades. The NCAI was one of many native and non-native organizations in support of the original court cases on this matter, *Harjo et al v. Pro Football, Inc.*, and we support the current case, *Blackhorse et al v. Pro Football, Inc.*, to cancel existing trademarks.

We are proud of all our people who struggle for dignity and fight against stereotypes, including Native and non-Native students, families, teachers, and others who have worked together to retire over 2,000 "Indian" names, logos, mascots, and behaviors in schools across the land. The use of Native Peoples as mascots is offensive and unjustifiable. We will continue to call for an end to this practice until the remaining stereotypes are gone from the American landscape.

Thank you and your co-sponsors for your leadership and courage in introducing this important legislation. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me or the NCAI Deputy Director, Robert Holden, at the National Congress of American Indians.

Respectfully,

JEFFERSON KEEL,  
President.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 2013]

FOR THE REDSKINS, WHAT'S IN A NAME?  
PLENTY

(By Dana Milbank)

You know a guy is in trouble when he hires Lanny Davis as his lawyer.

Davis has developed a specialty representing Third World dictators and questionable businesses since his days as a spokesman for Bill Clinton during the Monica Lewinsky scandal. So when Davis's name appeared on a statement from the Washington Redskins on Saturday afternoon declaring that President Obama was wrong to question the team's name, it was a sure sign that Dan Snyder is worried.

Davis, brought in this summer to help with the team-name controversy, expressed his disappointment "as a supporter of President Obama" that Obama was not aware of a decade-old poll finding that only one in 10 Native Americans were offended by the name. "We love our team and its name," he wrote, and "we do not intend to disparage or disrespect a racial or ethnic group."

I like Davis and admire his creativity, but, to borrow a Clinton-era phrase, let's parse this statement. Are the Redskins really defending the name with an out-of-date survey that allowed anybody—even somebody with less native blood than Elizabeth Warren—to identify as a Native American? And even if those results were accurate, are Davis and Snyder suggesting that racism is okay if it polls well?

To see whether it's right to use "Redskins" as a mascot, NFL owners gathered in Georgetown on Tuesday for their Fall meeting should substitute some other common racial epithets and see how they would sound: The Washington Wetbacks? The Houston Hymies? The Chicago Chinks? Or perhaps the New York Niggers? That would be enough to send anybody to the shotgun formation.

"This word is an insult. It's mean, it's rude, it's impolite," Kevin Gover, who is Native American and director of the

Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, said Monday at a news conference on the eve of the NFL meeting. "We've noticed that other racial insults are out of bounds. . . . We wonder why it is that the word that is directed at us, that refers to us, is not similarly off-limits."

Gover was part of a gathering arranged by the Oneida Nation at the Ritz-Carlton, the site of the owners meeting. The tribe has been running radio ads calling for a name change, and the cause got a boost when Obama said in an interview with the Associated Press on Saturday that he'd think about changing the name if he were in Snyder's shoes. Snyder is on record telling USA Today: "We'll never change the name. It's that simple. Never—you can use caps."

Actually, forget the Caps; let's use the Bullets, who became the Washington Wizards to avoid using what was a less offensive word than Redskins. Davis decries the "selective" outrage against the Redskins but not the Atlanta Braves or the Cleveland Indians or the Chicago Blackhawks. The Braves' Tomahawk Chop and Cleveland's Chief Wahoo are indeed appalling, but the team names aren't epithets.

"We're asking the NFL to stop using a racial slur," said Ray Halbritter, representing the Oneida Nation.

The best argument was made not by a Native American but by an African American, the District of Columbia's delegate to Congress, Eleanor Holmes Norton. "My grandfather was a runaway slave," she said. "I went to segregated schools, just like many Native Americans. . . . I don't see how anyone who has gone through our historic experience can fail to identify with Native Americans who are raising this issue. Need I remind them of the terms that have been attached to us in history and how the moment we hear one of those terms, you've got an uprising?"

That makes Davis's defense sound all the more trivial. "The name 'Washington Redskins' is 80 years old—it's our history and legacy and tradition," his statement said—as though that trumps the Native Americans' history and legacy and tradition.

Norton predicted that the offensive name won't last much longer. "The name is going to go in the dustbin of history," she said. "My only regret is that Dan Snyder, the owner of the team, had to be pushed this far."

If Snyder feels otherwise, perhaps he can start making his way to history's dustbin, and a new owner can change the name. Maybe then we'd win some football games.

Make your case: Should the Washington Redskins change their name?

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 2013]

INDIAN TRIBE PUSHES FOR WASHINGTON REDSKINS NAME CHANGE AS NFL OWNERS GATHER

(By Theresa Vargas and Mark Maske)

NFL officials will meet with the Native American group that is campaigning against the name of the Washington Redskins and hosted a symposium Monday on the issue a mile away from where league owners began gathering for a fall meeting.

"They know we're not going away," said Ray Halblitter, a representative for the Oneida Indian Nation. He called the meeting with the National Football League "a move in the right direction."

The symposium comes three days after President Obama took a stance in the long-standing debate, saying that if he were the team's owner, he would think about changing the name.

The Oneida Nation launched the "Change the Mascot" campaign a few months ago,

drawing inspiration from a high school in its back yard that dropped the "Redskins" moniker. Since then, the New York tribe has emerged as one of the strongest forces behind the growing push to scrap the Washington team's 80-year-old name, scheduling radio ads to run in every city the Redskins visit this season.

Its conference, held at the Ritz-Carlton in Georgetown, featured a panel of speakers that included the head of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, a psychologist who spoke about the public health consequences of the word, student activists and politicians—Rep. Betty McCollum (D-Minn.) and Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-D.C.).

"I can think of no argument for retaining a name that directly insults Americans and especially our first Americans," said Holmes Norton, speaking as a third-generation Washingtonian.

She said NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell showed leadership last month when he stepped back from his earlier defense of the team's name and said, "If one person's offended, we have to listen."

Nevertheless, no formal discussion of the Washington Redskins' name is expected among NFL owners who are gathering at another Ritz-Carlton in Washington for a one-day meeting Tuesday, according to two people familiar with the situation, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the topic.

They said they sense little or no sentiment within the league to urge Redskins owner Daniel Snyder to make a change.

NFL officials were invited to the Native American symposium, but none attended the event, Halbritter said. But he said he was encouraged that Goodell had instructed Adolpho Birch, the NFL's senior vice president for labor policy and government affairs, to schedule a meeting. The sit-down is scheduled for Nov. 22 at the league's offices, but two sources said it could be held sooner.

On Monday, as NFL franchise owners began arriving for their Tuesday gathering, several declined comment on the name-change issue.

Green Bay Packers President Mark Murphy, who once played for the Redskins, was the athletic director at Colgate when the school changed the name of its athletic teams from Red Raiders to Raiders in 2001. But he declined to speak Monday on the controversy.

"I'd rather not get into it," Murphy said.

Philadelphia Eagles owner Jeffrey Lurie also declined to comment.

In May, Redskins owner Daniel Snyder told USA Today, "We'll never change the name. It's that simple. NEVER—you can use caps."

In the months since, a string of prominent sports writers has stop penning the word. A group led by a former Federal Communications Commission chairman announced an effort to persuade broadcasters to stop saying the name on the airwaves. And a decision is expected soon in a lawsuit aimed at revoking the federal trademark protection of the team's name.

Kevin Gover, who heads the American Indian museum and whose son is a plaintiff in the trademark case, said the Oneida Nation has long been a powerful force in the American Indian community and that the tribe's involvement in the name-change issue has only elevated the conversation. He said he has little doubt that NFL officials, even if none attended the symposium, were listening to what was said.

"Like all major industries, the NFL is very interested in its public image," Gover said, "and when there is a challenge to that public image, the NFL is inclined to respond."

During Monday's event, Gover—who wrote a letter to The Washington Post about the



offensiveness of the name when he was a high school senior in 1973—spoke about how as a child he was called “redskin” and doesn’t understand why, unlike other racial slurs, the word has not become off limits.

Michael Friedman, a clinical psychologist who has researched the effects of stigma and discrimination, said the word amounts to harassment and causes mental and physical harm to a population that already faces higher rates of depression, alcoholism, suicide, diabetes and infant mortality.

“This is a public health issue,” he said. “This is not a political correctness issue.”

Also on the panel were two students from Cooperstown High School and the school board’s president, who earlier this year were behind the decision to change the school’s team from the Redskins to the Hawkeyes. The Oneida Nation later paid for the school’s new uniforms.

The tribe, which has about 1,000 members, has prospered in the casino and resort business and has pledged \$10 million over 10 years to the American Indian museum.

The tribe also sponsors the Buffalo Bills and has a “vested interest in the league being a unifying force,” Habritter said.

“As an Indian nation that values the idea of mutual respect, we only have one simple objective in all of this,” Habritter said. “We no longer want to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We don’t want our children to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We want to be treated as what we are: Americans.”

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 2013]

#### TACKLING THE OFFENSIVE

(By Dana Milbank)

You know a guy is in trouble when he hires Lanny Davis as his lawyer.

Davis has developed a specialty representing Third World dictators and questionable businesses since his days as a spokesman for Bill Clinton during the Monica Lewinsky scandal. So when Davis’s name appeared on a statement from the Washington Redskins on Saturday afternoon declaring that President Obama was wrong to question the team’s name, it was a sure sign that Dan Snyder is worried.

Davis, brought in this summer to help with the team-name controversy, expressed his disappointment “as a supporter of President Obama” that Obama was not aware of a decade-old poll finding that only one in 10 Native Americans were offended by the name. “We love our team and its name,” he wrote, and “we do not intend to disparage or disrespect a racial or ethnic group.”

I like Davis and admire his creativity, but, to borrow a Clinton-era phrase, let’s parse this statement. Are the Redskins really defending the name with an out-of-date survey that allowed anybody—even somebody with less native blood than Elizabeth Warren—to identify as a Native American? And even if those results were accurate, are Davis and Snyder suggesting that racism is okay if it polls well?

To see whether it’s right to use “Redskins” as a mascot, NFL owners gathering in Georgetown on Tuesday for their fall meeting should substitute some other common racial epithets for Hispanics, African Americans, Asians and Jews and see how they would sound. That would be enough to send anybody to the shotgun formation.

“This word is an insult. It’s mean, it’s rude, it’s impolite,” Kevin Gover, who is Native American and director of the Smithsonian’s National Museum of the American Indian, said Monday at a news conference on the eve of the NFL meeting. “We’ve noticed that other racial insults are out of bounds. . . . We wonder why it is that the word that is directed at us, that refers to us, is not similarly off-limits.”

Gover was part of a gathering arranged by the Oneida Nation at the Ritz-Carlton, the site of the owners meeting. The tribe has been running radio ads calling for a name change, and the cause got a boost when Obama said in an interview with the Associated Press on Saturday that he’d think about changing the name if he were in Snyder’s shoes. Snyder is on record telling USA Today: “We’ll never change the name. It’s that simple. Never—you can use caps.”

Actually, forget the Caps; let’s use the Bullets, who became the Washington Wizards to avoid using what was a less offensive word than Redskins. Davis decries the “selective” outrage against the Redskins but not the Atlanta Braves or the Cleveland Indians or the Chicago Blackhawks. The Braves’ Tomahawk Chop and Cleveland Chief Wahoo are indeed appalling, but the team names aren’t epithets. “We’re asking the NFL to stop using a racial slur,” said Ray Halbritter, representing the Oneida Nation.

The best argument was made not by a Native American but by an African American, the District of Columbia’s delegate to Congress, Eleanor Holmes Norton. “My great-grandfather was a runaway slave,” she said. “I went to segregated schools, just like many Native Americans. . . . I don’t see how anyone who has gone through our historic experience can fail to identify with Native Americans who are raising this issue. Need I remind them of the terms that have been attached to us in history and how the moment we hear one of those terms, you’ve got an uprising?”

That makes Davis’s defense sound all the more trivial. “The name ‘Washington Redskins’ is 80 years old—it’s our history and legacy and tradition,” his statement said—as though that trumps the Native Americans’ history and legacy and tradition.

Norton predicted that the offensive name won’t last much longer. “The name is going to go in the dustbin of history,” she said. “My only regret is that Dan Snyder, the owner of the team, had to be pushed this far.”

If Snyder feels otherwise, perhaps he can start making his way to history’s dustbin, and a new owner can change the name. Maybe then we’d win some football games.

#### NFL TO MEET TRIBE OVER REDSKINS NAME

(By Theresa Vargas and Mark Maske)

NFL officials will meet with the Native American group that is campaigning against the name of the Washington Redskins and hosted a symposium Monday on the issue a mile away from where league owners began gathering for a fall meeting.

“They know we’re not going away,” said Ray Halbritter, a representative for the Oneida Indian Nation. He called the meeting with the National Football League “a move in the right direction.”

The symposium comes three days after President Obama took a stance in the long-standing debate, saying that if he were the team’s owner, he would think about changing the name.

The Oneida Nation launched the “Change the Mascot” campaign a few months ago, drawing inspiration from a high school in its back yard that dropped the “Redskins” moniker. Since then, the New York tribe has emerged as one of the strongest forces behind the growing push to scrap the Washington team’s 80-year-old name, scheduling radio ads to run in every city the Redskins visit this season.

Its conference, held at the Ritz-Carlton in Georgetown, featured a panel of speakers that included the head of the Smithsonian’s National Museum of the American Indian, a psychologist who spoke about the public

health consequences of the word, student activists and politicians—Rep. Betty McCollum (D-Minn.) and Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-D.C.).

“I can think of no argument for retaining a name that directly insults Americans and especially our first Americans,” said Holmes Norton, speaking as a third-generation Washingtonian.

She said NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell showed leadership last month when he stepped back from his earlier defense of the team’s name and said, “If one person’s offended, we have to listen.”

Nevertheless, no formal discussion of the Washington Redskins’ name is expected among NFL owners who are gathering at another Ritz-Carlton in Washington for a one-day meeting Tuesday, according to two people familiar with the situation, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the topic.

They said they sense little or no sentiment within the league to urge Redskins owner Daniel Snyder to make a change.

NFL officials were invited to the Native American symposium, but none attended the event, Halbritter said. But he said he was encouraged that Goodell had instructed Adolpho Birch, the NFL’s senior vice president for labor policy and government affairs, to schedule a meeting. The sit-down is scheduled for Nov. 22 at the league’s offices, but two sources said it could be held sooner.

On Monday, as NFL franchise owners began arriving for their Tuesday gathering, several declined to comment on the name-change issue.

Green Bay Packers President Mark Murphy, who once played for the Redskins, was the athletic director at Colgate when the school changed the name of its athletic teams from Red Raiders to Raiders in 2001. But he declined to speak Monday on the controversy.

“I’d rather not get into it,” Murphy said. Philadelphia Eagles owner Jeffrey Lurie also declined to comment.

In May, Redskins owner Daniel Snyder told USA Today, “We’ll never change the name. It’s that simple. NEVER—you can use caps.”

In the months since, a string of prominent sports writers has stopped penning the name. A group led by a former Federal Communications Commission chairman announced an effort to persuade broadcasters to stop saying the name on the airwaves. And a decision is expected soon in a lawsuit aimed at revoking the federal trademark protection of the team’s name.

Kevin Gover, who heads the American Indian museum and whose son is a plaintiff in the trademark case, said the Oneida Nation has long been a powerful force in the American Indian community and that the tribe’s involvement in the name-change issue has only elevated the conversation. He said he has little doubt that NFL officials, even if none attended the symposium, were listening to what was said.

“Like all major industries, the NFL is very interested in its public image,” Gover said, “and when there is a challenge to that public image, the NFL is inclined to respond.”

During Monday’s event, Gover—who wrote a letter to The Washington Post about the offensiveness of the name when he was a high school senior in 1973—spoke about how as a child he was called “redskin” and doesn’t understand why, unlike other racial slurs, the word has not become off limits.

Michael Friedman, a clinical psychologist who has researched the effects of stigma and discrimination, said the word amounts to harassment and causes mental and physical harm to a population that already faces higher rates of depression, alcoholism, suicide, diabetes and infant mortality.

"This is a public health issue," he said. "This is not a political correctness issue."

Also on the panel were two students from Cooperstown High School and the school board's president, who earlier this year were behind the decision to change the school's team from the Redskins to the Hawkeyes. The Oneida Nation later paid for the school's new uniforms.

The tribe, which has about 1,000 members, has prospered in the casino and resort business and has pledged \$10 million over 10 years to the American Indian museum.

The tribe also sponsors the Buffalo Bills and has a "vested interest in the league being a unifying force," Halbritter said.

"As an Indian nation that values the idea of mutual respect, we only have one simple objective in all of this," Halbritter said. "We no longer want to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We don't want our children to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We want to be treated as what we are: Americans."

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF MARVIN COGHILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to pay tribute to my friend Marvin Coghill, a great North Carolinian who passed away on August 18. Marvin was an international leader in the tobacco industry, but much more than this, he loved the Old North State, and his many acts of kindness and generosity exemplify the good and humble man that he was.

Marvin was born and raised in a farming community in Vance County. Always the diplomat, Marvin studied at NC State University for a year, then went up the road to rival UNC-Chapel Hill. His college days were cut short in 1952, though, when he joined the U.S. Navy and honorably served our country in the Korean War.

The end of Marvin's military service marked the beginning of his career with Standard Commercial Tobacco Company in London in 1957. He traveled thousands of miles from eastern North Carolina on behalf of Standard Commercial, eventually settling in Thailand in 1963, where he married his first wife, Tomoe.

Rising through the ranks, Marvin was named president and CEO of Standard Commercial in 1980. A year later, his adventure came full circle when he returned to North Carolina. For the rest of his life, he called Wilson his home. A man of great talents, he continued to lead Standard Commercial until his retirement in 2000.

In his later years, Marvin would be honored with countless local awards and recognitions, and many organizations, including Wilson Medical Center Foundation, the Salvation Army Boys and Girls Club, and the Tobacco Farm Life Museum benefited from Marvin's generosity.

Marvin also became deeply involved as a cofounder of Wilson Youth United, an organization dedicated to improving the prospects of at-risk youths.

But that was just like Marvin. He had personally helped pay for many young folks to attend college, and after retirement, he redirected his considerable talents towards improving his community.

It was also in retirement that he married fellow Henderson native, Anne Coghill.

One of Marvin's great contributions to the world was his love of people. With his impeccable manners and gift of storytelling, any conversation with Marvin was a real delight. He saw what men and women were capable of, and throughout his life, he always brought out the best in people. Always outwardly focused, Marvin looked for ways to enrich the lives of people around him.

Through the years, you'd often find Marvin enjoying breakfast at the Country Restaurant in Wilson. He was very modest, and you would never expect, when you first met him, that you were talking to one of the true titans of the tobacco industry worldwide.

But you were always touched by his big heart and bigger personality, and each and every one of us is a better person for having met and known my friend Marvin Coghill. He will be greatly missed by me and many others throughout the world.

#### END THE TRAVESTY AND DO WHAT'S RIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to start this morning with something that we, as Democrats and Republicans, can immediately address.

Coming from a State that has sent probably one of the largest percentages of men and women to our faraway shores as members of the United States military and, in particular, Afghanistan, I stand here today to reach out to the Pentagon and to others to be able to embrace the five families that are now facing the most devastating news: that their loved one was lost in Afghanistan in a war over the weekend.

Yes, as we bring our troops home, as I've advocated for a very, very long time, as well in Iraq, our soldiers are still dying in a place of war.

I want immediately for the \$100,000 death benefit and the flight to Dover to be given to these families. I'm reaching out to the Pentagon, writing a letter, and asking that this be immediately resolved.

Last week, we passed legislation to indicate that the United States military would continue to be paid. I, as a lawyer, not in military law, could make the argument and make it today on the floor of the House that that gives authority to provide those death benefits and, as well, the transportation cost to Dover Air Force Base.

If we can do anything, if we cannot do much, we certainly can come together around the brave men and women in the United States military.

This shutdown is shameful. It is indicative of the worst of not appreciating the institution of this place and the priority of the American people.

But I know that there is a great love and affection and recognition that, but for those who leave this place, the United States of America, willingly, to sacrifice their lives on behalf of the great freedom that this country promotes, the constitutional government that this country supports, and is valued through the Constitution—there is no way that I will continue to stand here on this floor in the midst of a shutdown and allow this travesty to occur.

So I am asking that we immediately respond to these individuals and these families, and we let them know that God loves them and so does this Nation, which appreciates and is grateful for the sacrifices of their loved ones.

It is a grateful Nation, and we will not stand for this outrage that impacts these innocent families who now, not only are mourning the tragedy of the loss of a young life, but also the devastation of a response.

I don't know why we continue in this shutdown that is, frankly, a situation that is, in essence, not following the parliamentary procedures.

□ 1100

We know that the process of budgeting is a separate process from opening the doors of the government, and I just cited the tragedy that I want to have a solution to. But as I say that, I want us to have a solution to turning the tide on opening the government.

We know that there are enough Republicans and Democrats who would vote for a clean bill to open this House right now. I say this because it pains me to hear of the tragedy that I just spoke of, which I look to be resolved within hours, and I say that broadly to the military families around America and around the world.

But in addition to solving that crisis, we need to be able to open the government for veterans. In the next couple of days, they will see those veterans centers shut down. Those are the centers where veterans go for employment and benefit issues they have.

A couple of weeks ago, I stood before the DeGeorge Hotel in Houston, Texas, which is now a veterans center and a home for homeless veterans. I was there with people who said, My life has not been the best. I served my country, but this is my home now. I don't want to move. I want to get on my feet and live in the DeGeorge Hotel.

These are men and women who were willing to put on the Nation's uniform and offer themselves in Vietnam and many places around the world and now have come to a point where they're homeless and being served by veterans resources, and now we're telling them that they cannot have the services that they need.

In a couple of days, the Federal courts are looking at possibly shutting down Federal courts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to hear from one of our Republican friends saying, This is exactly what I wanted; I'm excited the government is shut down.

Think of our military and our veterans. Let's come together to make a difference in this world.

#### COME TO THE BARGAINING TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, why are we here today in the middle of the government shutdown? The answer, frankly, is that the Senate refuses to come to the table to negotiate.

The House has passed four different measures that would have kept the government open. The Senate has ignored them all.

Before the government shut down, the House passed a bill which would keep the government open and defund the President's health care law. Well, it is probable that the Senate wasn't going to support that, but I was thinking at least we would be able to get documentation as to whether there would be some Democrat support for that.

That having failed, we passed a second measure to keep the government open and simply delay the President's health care law by 1 year. After all, the President himself had delayed portions of the law.

Obviously, that didn't play with the Senate.

So then we passed another piece of legislation which would have funded the government and would have funded the President's health care law, but simply would have made the law fairer for all Americans.

The President changed the law by executive order—a procedure of questionable legality—but he changed the law, giving large employers a 1-year delay in the employer mandate. In other words, employers were required to offer insurance or face a fine. The President, by executive order, changed the law to delay that for 1 year. We asked simply to give the individual the same prerogative that the President gave large employers: delay the requirement to buy insurance for 1 year without having to pay a fine.

We also asked that Congress, the President, and the Vice President be treated the same as all other Americans. The President changed the law by executive order—a procedure of questionable legality—saying that Congress would get a different deal in the exchanges than the average individual. When I went home to my district in August and did 12 town hall meetings, there was universal disgust for that rule.

So in our proposal to the Senate, we said, We'll fund the government, but simply change the rule concerning Congress so that Congress is treated the same as every American. Let's change the law so that the individual is treat-

ed the same as a large employer. I don't see how that's holding a gun to anyone's head. That is simply fairness for the American people.

And that was rejected by the Senate.

Then we simply asked the Senate to come to the table. Well, if this proposal, which just makes the law equitable for every American, is unacceptable to you, would you please come to the table and let's talk about what is acceptable to you. Let's sit down and negotiate.

Mr. Reagan presided over his terms in office with a Democrat-controlled House, and yet he worked with Mr. O'Neill and got significant legislation done. Mr. Clinton worked with a Republican House and got significant legislation done and made real progress with welfare reform and many other issues in the Clinton Presidency, but they worked across the aisle. They worked with a House of different parties and got things done.

Now we have a President who says, I'm not going to negotiate. We have a leader in the Senate who says, I'm not going to negotiate.

Each part of our government has a role to play—the executive, the Senate, the House. Frankly, in the whole history of the Republic, we've never had a situation where the President says, I'm not going to negotiate, or where one House says to the other House, We're not going to negotiate. This is, frankly, unbelievable. It's a step in our government which I don't think the American people want.

This is not about the President's health care law. This is about the function of our government and how each section of the government deals with each other. I think the American people want it to go in the traditional fashion, where the House, the Senate and the President work together to find a solution.

When the Senate refuses to pass legislation and won't even consider talking to us, that's not right. We in the House have passed legislation to fund FEMA, to fund our national parks, to fund WIC, to fund our veterans, to fund the National Institutes of Health, the FDA, and the National Guard. By the end of tomorrow, we'll have funded more than half the government in this House, and yet the Senate won't take any of that up and won't even negotiate with us. We even made sure that furloughed employees will be paid.

The Obama administration has given exceptions to their allies, Big Business, and some unions. Why shouldn't the American people be given the same kind of treatment?

The administration and the Senate should come to the bargaining table today and end this shutdown.

#### GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it is now day 8 of House Republicans' reckless, irresponsible government shutdown. In that time, America has been demanding to hear one reasonable, responsible proposal from House Republicans about how they plan to reopen the U.S. Government.

While House Republicans refuse to capitulate, New Mexicans are still hurting. They're hurting because one radical faction of one party in the House stands in the way, holding the entire Congress and the entire country hostage.

First, this band of radicals forced a government shutdown just to get its way. They have caused significant economic harm and are wasting hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars every day. These are the same Republicans who promised fiscal responsibility.

Now they're dangerously close to forcing an economic shutdown by threatening a catastrophic debt default if they don't get what they want. The problem? They don't even know what they want. As my Republican colleague from Indiana said last week:

We have to get something out of this, and I don't know what that even is.

As Speaker BOEHNER admitted the other day, he committed to Senate leadership that he would support the very same bill—a clean continuing resolution—for which he now refuses a vote on the floor.

On Sunday, I was back in Albuquerque, meeting with Federal employees who have been furloughed. I heard heartbreaking stories of families who say that because of the shutdown, they're worried about paying their mortgages and utility payments and car loans and credit card bills. That's what they're concerned about. That's what keeps them up at night.

I heard from a civilian air traffic controller at Kirtland Air Force Base who was worried about the safety of the airmen because he's not allowed to work. Federal employees are demoralized and feel abandoned. They don't understand why they are being blamed for House Republicans' failure to pass a clean funding compromise.

But in a 2½-hour meeting, not one of the furloughed New Mexicans told me he wants to see the Affordable Care Act repealed. Not one. I think that shows how far removed from reality House Republicans are. They're willing to continue harming hardworking, innocent Americans because of their obsession with destroying the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is reckless behavior.

As this shutdown carries on into week 2, we keep learning of more negative impacts. Sandia National Labs, one of the largest employers in my district, has started notifying its more than 10,000 employees that they are likely to experience furloughs if the government doesn't reopen soon. That

will have an absolutely devastating ripple effect on our local economy that we may never recover from.

Instead of voting to end the shutdown, House Republicans have wasted time with false and misleading attempts to reopen the government bit by bit. After all, they didn't shut down the government piece by piece, so we shouldn't open it that way either.

The one bill that House Republican leadership should be bringing to the House floor today is the Senate-passed, clean funding compromise, which would go directly to the President and immediately open up the entire government for all New Mexicans and Americans.

We know that there are enough votes right now to pass a clean funding compromise. So why won't the Republican leadership allow a vote on it?

I understand that some of my Republican colleagues say part of the reason they got elected was because they pledged to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. We were all sent here to represent our constituents. I know that.

I'm here to represent constituents who are being hammered by the sequester. I've said many times in this Chamber that we need to immediately replace the sequester with a balanced approach to deficit reduction, but I'm not prepared to keep the government shut down because of it, inflicting further harm on people, not only in my district, but around the country.

In spite of the damaging effect the sequestration continues to have on my State, I am prepared to vote right now for a temporary compromise bill that funds the government at sequester levels. I am prepared to vote for it as is virtually every Democrat in the House. The Senate has already passed it. The President says he'll sign it immediately.

We want to get rid of the sequester, but we're willing to vote for a compromised funding bill at sequester levels, and I'll tell you why—because, at this time, it's a reasonable path forward.

So to my Republican friends who don't like the Affordable Care Act, here's a proposal for you: let's reopen the government now with a clean funding bill. Let's put all the furloughed Federal employees back to work. Then we can work together to determine what parts of the Affordable Care Act work well and which parts need to be addressed. After a reasonable amount of time, we can make the necessary adjustments to the law.

That's how you effectively represent your constituents who still have serious concerns about the Affordable Care Act. That's a reasonable path forward.

Mr. Speaker, let's reopen government right now. Then let's work together on a long-term solution that addresses the serious and significant fiscal issues facing our Nation today.

#### TIME TO SHOW LEADERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, Irish leader Henry Boyle once said:

The most important trip you can make in life is meeting people halfway.

Unfortunately, in this debate, the President and HARRY REID's latest offers are way short of halfway. They won't even come to the negotiating table.

During this shutdown, the Republicans in the House have passed nine bills to fund and reopen vital functions of government. Let me go through some of them for you:

Twenty-five of my Democratic colleagues voted with House Republicans to fund pediatric cancer research. Twenty-three of my Democrats colleagues voted with Republicans to reopen national parks, memorials, and monuments;

□ 1115

Thirty-five of my Democratic colleagues voted with Republicans, honoring our promise to give veterans the benefits they have earned;

Thirty-six of my Democratic colleagues voted with Republicans to pay our National Guard and Army Reserve personnel;

Twenty-three of my Democratic colleagues voted with Republicans to make sure funds are available to provide disaster relief; and

One hundred eighty-nine of my Democratic colleagues voted with House Republicans to provide backpay for furloughed Federal employees.

Each of these are reasonable proposals, yet HARRY REID insists that virtually all of them will not be considered in the Senate, and the President has threatened a veto.

Let me repeat. House Republicans have passed bills to fund pediatric cancer research, reopen national parks, provide benefits to veterans, pay salaries for our National Guard, fund disaster relief programs and other vital services. Dozens of my Democratic colleagues have voted for each of these bills, yet the President and HARRY REID won't budge.

The American people are disappointed in this shutdown—after all, this is not the way government is supposed to work—but the American people are also figuring this out. This shutdown can end if HARRY REID and President Obama meet House Republicans at the negotiating table—but their chairs sit empty.

The American people don't want the President's health care law, but they are ready for this shutdown to end. It's time for both parties to listen to the American people, work out our differences, and find a commonsense way forward.

#### GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, while referencing how long the government shutdown lasts, a senior Obama administration official told *The Wall Street Journal*:

It really doesn't matter how long the government shutdown lasts because we are winning.

But, Mr. Speaker, as you know and I know, this government shutdown isn't a game. There are no winners when Washington fails the most basic test of governing. That is why this body passed four bipartisan proposals to keep the government open while shielding Americans from the disastrous effects of President Obama's health care law.

Once a shutdown was triggered by Senate Democrats, we worked to minimize its harmful effects with the passage of bills to reopen our national parks and museums, to restore critical funding for children's cancer research, fund the Veterans Administration, and to continue providing nutritional assistance through the Women, Infants, and Children program, among other measures. Now we're waiting on President Obama and the Senate Democrats to do their part.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents can't wait too much longer. Across my district, Tennesseans are feeling the very real impact of President Obama and the Senate Democrats' continued refusal to negotiate.

Larry, in Jamestown, is a park concessionaire at Big South Fork Recreation Area. Fall is his busiest season. He estimates that he lost \$7,500 on an engagement he had planned for 11 months—canceled because of the government shutdown.

Following the Veterans Administration's warning that they could run out of funding as early as late October, Charles in Crossville emailed my office pleading for help: "I am a disabled veteran who depends on my compensation check to have some quality of life," he wrote. "This is unacceptable."

Bobby, in Fentress County, is a craftsman, who was supposed to have his work displayed in the Smithsonian American Art Gallery last Thursday—a proud moment stolen from him because of an unnecessary gridlock here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, our Senate colleagues have the power to end this arbitrary and unnecessary pain today by taking up the House-passed measures to reopen our parks and museums, to restore veterans' benefits and fund other important functions of government. What we need now is for them to act.

Our constituents expect us to listen to them, to work out our differences, and to find a commonsense way forward. Why can't we at least give them that? HARRY REID and President Obama need to listen to the people of this country and come to the table and negotiate. Let's get our work done.

### SHUTDOWN DUE TO LACK OF LEADERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, why are we here?

We are here because of a failure of leadership. The fact is the President of the United States has failed to negotiate. The fact is the Majority Leader of the Senate, the head of the Senate, has failed and refuses to negotiate.

It's interesting how time changes one's perspective. Let me quote Barack Obama before he became President. These are the words of Barack Obama. He said:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means "the buck stops here." Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Barack Obama said it very well before he became President. Now he needs to serve and act as President and provide the leadership.

The fact is October 1 is the beginning of the financial year, and we should responsibly fund the government. The fact is, in just a few more days, we will reach \$17 trillion in indebtedness—nearly half of that incurred since Barack Obama has become President. Think about that. They're going to come and ask for another \$1.9 trillion to keep us going for 1 more year. That means in 6 years we will double the debt that's racking up the greatest debt in the history of mankind for any government.

Republicans might like to think that we won the House of Representatives back in 2010 and '95, but it was the same issues: spending, taxes, and health care. Remember HillaryCare and the taxes and other things imposed by President Clinton. The difference is President Clinton negotiated with us. We balanced the budget within 2 years. We can do that if good people of good faith will come together and negotiate, but we can't negotiate by ourselves.

The Constitution empowered the House of Representatives to be in charge of and responsible for levying taxes—because we're closest to the people—and spending. We have that responsibility. They sent us here. They elected us, rejecting the spending that went on. They saw what went on—\$1 trillion more than you took in, spending, the first year of this Presidency, and \$1 trillion since. So we must act responsibly, but we must have leadership starting from the White House, starting from the Senate.

Republicans in the House are ready to negotiate. We were here when the Senate didn't show up on Sunday. They didn't show up to work the day before the 1st of October to fund this current year. We must be here to meet, responsibly, our debt. We can't put that debt, as the President has said before he was

President, on the backs of our children and grandchildren; but we can't do that without the system working. We need leadership—leadership from the President to negotiate, leadership from the Senate to negotiate.

Our leadership has said they will negotiate. We've been here—we'll stay here—but we need to responsibly fund all the activities of government even if it's piece by piece, as we have responsibly done, and sent them over to the other body, and they sit there.

But again, I urge all of the leaders to come together, and my colleagues, particularly the Senate and the President of the United States. We can do responsibly what we need to do, as designated by the Constitution of the United States, and provide that leadership.

### MILITARY FAMILY BENEFITS DURING SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with this body and the American people a great injustice. A few moments ago, one of my colleagues from Texas, from across the aisle, spoke of this as well. So as you can see, there are many times that we all can come together and agree upon certain items and move the American people forward in a better way; however, this particular situation is unthinkable.

A great injustice is being done to our servicemembers and their families. We learned last night that five brave American servicemembers were killed over the weekend in Afghanistan while selflessly protecting our country. Normally, Mr. Speaker, the loved ones of these fallen warriors receive assistance in the form of benefits to help them make those final arrangements for burial and other necessary preparations. Yet, as a direct result of the political gridlock here in Washington and despite legislation passed in this House last week with great bipartisan support, servicemembers and their families are no longer receiving their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, despite the government shutdown, our servicemembers are still expected to go to war, knowing full well that they may pay the ultimate sacrifice for this great Nation, and we should be expected to keep our promises to their family members. I am working, as we speak, to right this wrong, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

### GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress to help people, not to hurt people, and this shutdown is hurting innocent Americans.

This past Sunday, I flew back home because Congress was not in session. We were not voting on Sunday, so I took a flight home to California to meet with my constituents in my congressional district.

I held a town hall. I held it at Dublin City Hall. Dublin City Hall is where I served as a city council member. Dublin is also home to many Federal employers. In my congressional district, we have 4,000 Federal employees, plus a number of government contractors who work at Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Laboratories. I also held it there because, for 2 years as a city council member, I worked in that chamber day in and day out to make sure that we provided a balanced budget. We provided a 2-year budget.

It is so frustrating for me here in the Congress that we provide budgets that are only 45 or 60 days at a time, and across America our city councils are thinking big and thinking forward and balancing their budgets while taking measured investments in the future.

So we gathered the community of California's 15th Congressional District at Dublin City Hall, and we had over 150 people attend. The room was filled with fear and anxiety. Federal workers were in the room, worried about what this was going to mean for the personal incomes, for their families, for their household bills. Even though Federal workers in my district have been furloughed, their bills have not been furloughed. The home lenders are still calling, asking where the mortgages are. Their auto loans are still going to be due. Their credit card statements will still arrive. If they have kids in college, they're still going to have to pay tuition.

The Federal employees told me about the stress that they're living under either by not being able to work or, even worse, by being told that they have to work, but they're not going to receive their paychecks right now. In fact, we were reminded in this very Chamber just last week how stressful that can be, when the Capitol Hill Police, who stand guard here at democracy's door, who protect the people's House, rushed to aid the Members of Congress and the employees who work in this building as an erratic driver drove into a barricaded area just outside the Capitol grounds. Those Capitol Hill police are working to protect us, but they're doing so without pay.

So I heard stories just like that in my congressional district from the employees in our district, who are very scared about what's going to happen next. We learned that this is affecting people who work not just inside government, but also outside government.

□ 1130

Inside government, we have employees at Camp Parks Reserve Forces Training Area, the NASA facility in Dublin. We also have a women's Federal prison.

Outside government, we have government contract employees—about 6,500

of them—at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and about 1,500 of them at Sandia National Laboratories.

They told us, if the government shutdown continues, they may be furloughed within the next 10 days.

Most strikingly, the Republicans who attended expressed their concern, as we have heard in this Chamber, about the Affordable Care Act. I understand that, but not a single Republican who attended told me or told our other constituents that they believe their concerns over the Affordable Care Act were worth prolonging this government shutdown.

There are also concerns about, well, why don't we just get some of the government up and running like some of the bills that we passed last week but that the Senate won't take up? I told my constituents I will not support any bill that pits any constituency against each other. We saw bills that pitted veterans against seniors, sick children against the poor. It is time to get the government up and running for everybody. Veterans who attended our town hall agreed. They served this country to make sure that the government works for everybody, not just for the veterans who served it.

I am inspired by, and I told my constituents that I have hope in, a freshman group that continues to gather a couple times each week and that was here during the shutdown crisis, called the United Solutions Caucus. It has about 15 Members on the Republican side and 15 on the Democratic side. They are freshman Members of Congress who are meeting and talking about what we can do to work together.

Finally, to my colleagues across the aisle, I ask you this respectfully: Did you come to Congress to help people or did you come to Congress to hurt people? If you came here to help, just like I did, then I think you know what to do next. Turn on the lights of the government that runs the greatest democracy in the world, and let's get America working again.

#### IT IS TIME TO PUT THE INTERESTS OF AMERICANS FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Day No. 8, Mr. Speaker.

Today is day No. 8 of a government shutdown. Enough of the gamesmanship. Enough with the name-calling. Enough with the blame game. It is time we opened up the government.

Real Americans are getting hurt, like Brian from Carmichael. Brian has been out of work for 2 years. He recently got a job offer that requires him to get a class B driver's license. Well, he went to the DMV. He was told he needed a Social Security card, which he lost a couple years ago. He went to the Social Security office to get a card. Do you know what he was told: the office is closed. They have been furloughed.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to open up the government. Real Americans like Brian are getting hurt. Let's get Brian his job, and let's open up the government.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Lord, You know there are many Americans who look to the people's House as uncertainty about the future of the economy and their livelihoods hang in the balance.

Bless the Members of the people's House with the understanding that it is their work to develop the strategies and the plans to assuage the fears of their fellow countrymen and -women.

We again ask You to impel those who possess power here in the Capitol to be mindful of those whom they represent who possess little or no power and whose lives are made all the more difficult by a failure to work out serious differences.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it has been 1 week since the government shutdown. For 1 week, the President and Senate Democrats have refused to negotiate to reopen the government's doors.

House Republicans know the hardships American families are facing due to Washington Democrats' failure to negotiate. We have worked over the past week, passing bills to have the government functioning.

House Republicans have voted to fund pediatric cancer research, reopen national parks, memorials and monuments, give veterans the benefits they have earned and deserve. On Saturday, House Republicans voted to pay 800,000 furloughed employees who are at risk of losing a paycheck due to the President's government shutdown.

With the debt ceiling limit looming, the American people are waiting for the President and Senate Democrats to negotiate a solution for fiscal responsibility.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today we find our Nation in the midst of a government shutdown and in the shadows of a debt default.

A week into the shutdown, the partisan gridlock in Congress is as bad as ever; but across the country, millions of Americans are finding new hope in the affordable health coverage on the online exchanges.

Despite the more than 40 Republican attempts to repeal, defund, or derail this law, the Affordable Care Act is finally fulfilling the promise of dependable, affordable health coverage for millions of our fellow Americans.

On opening day, the exchanges were inundated with millions of users—



Americans excited to learn more about their new coverage options. It was a little bumpy, as expected, but no fleeting Web page glitches can distract us from the fact that for the first time millions of uninsured Americans who have lived in dread that an illness or an accident could plunge them into financial ruin will finally have access to good coverage that they can afford.

Today is a dark day here in D.C., but for the thousands of people I represent, a long night is ending. And that's worth celebrating.

#### ANGELS IN ADOPTION

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 2013 Angels in Adoption, Jessie and Kayci Prince, from my hometown, Plano, Texas.

As children, both Jessie and Kayci were touched by adoption. Having experienced the powerful impact adoption has on families, they decided to adopt one of their own. In 2012, Ezekiel—Zeke for short—from the Democratic Republic of Congo, became part of the Prince family.

As the Princes helped Zeke learn how to read, they quickly learned how challenging it was to find books that depict transracial families.

They decided as a family to write, illustrate, and publish "That's a Yummy Color," a children's book celebrating adoption. This book is now helping other families form special bonds with their own adopted children.

I am grateful for the compassionate families like the Princes.

Jessie and Kayci, you are truly an inspiration. God bless you.

#### OBAMACARE

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week the health insurance marketplace opened, giving millions access to quality health care. Since then, there has been too much focus on the small hiccups that are to be expected when any large program is implemented.

Yesterday, I received a letter from a North Carolina woman who lives over 600 miles from my home district in Illinois. Like many Illinoisans, she believes the positives of the Affordable Care Act are being overlooked. She said:

My family has already benefited from the Affordable Care Act as I have two children just finishing college. I am relieved I can keep them on my medical coverage at no cost. This saves them money and gives me peace of mind. The cost of our health care plan has decreased by \$400.

Like many, she wants to ask Congress: Is this why you shut down the government, to keep me and my chil-

dren from getting affordable health care?

Citizens are sick and tired of the misinformation being spread about the ACA. The ACA didn't cause the shutdown. The shutdown is a symptom of what really ails America—cynicism that allows a few to take hollow ideological stances at the expense of many.

Like me, she wants us to pass a clean CR and end this shutdown today.

#### MR. PRESIDENT: THIS IS OUR LAND

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, President Obama must stop playing politics with our National Park System. The parks belong to every American and should not be held hostage in President Obama's political game.

In the 1960s, the Federal Government established the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in south central Missouri under the guise of protecting the rivers and forests for all Missourians. Some 50 years later, President Obama is taking away our access. The riverways do not belong to President Obama. They belong to my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama is working to make his shutdown as painful as possible. The President has barricaded parks and monuments across the country, including the open-air World War II Memorial in Washington. It costs more money to barricade the monuments than it would to leave them open.

The national parks do not belong to President Obama. The parks belong to every American. It's time for President Obama to open our national parks. It's time for President Obama to stop playing politics with our parks.

#### MONEY AND POLITICS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this government shutdown has clearly demonstrated our democracy is not working the way it was designed. Unfortunately, this is largely due to the oversized influence and obscene amount of money in politics which continue to fuel our distorted political process, and it could get worse.

Today, the Supreme Court is hearing arguments in the McCutcheon case, the second-coming of Citizens United. This case could open the door to even more money flooding our political process. Money and politics have paralyzed Washington and have paralyzed my Republican colleagues' will to compromise. They would be more apt to compromise if they were not absolutely petrified of the Koch brothers spending millions of dollars to unseat them.

We cannot afford to have a system of government fueled by money that re-

wards confrontation and condemns compromise. If we don't fix this underlying problem, money and politics, we will continue to lurch from crisis to crisis, and the American people ultimately lose.

#### GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, back home, Hoosiers know that we only solve problems by sitting down and talking. Unfortunately, President Obama and Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID refuse to join Republicans in the constructive, respectful dialogue that Washington desperately needs. Eight days ago, Senate Democrats shut down the government by refusing four separate House-passed bills to fund the government.

It's clear that the American people don't want this shutdown, and it's exactly why the House has passed nine bipartisan, commonsense bills to fund and reopen parts of government that we all agree on.

Together, House Republicans and House Democrats have passed bills to ensure that the National Guard is paid, veterans' benefits are funded, and our national parks are reopened. Unfortunately, these common-ground solutions are gathering dust in the Senate as HARRY REID refuses to come to the table and talk.

The American people don't expect Republicans and Democrats to agree on everything, but they do expect us to talk. It's time for Senate Democrats to put aside their obstructionism and come to the table.

#### GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the truth is out. Republican leaders and their big donors have been planning this shutdown for over 2 years. Why? They claim it's because of ObamaCare, but it's now clear to everyone that it is plainly and simply about Obama.

He won re-election, and they still can't deal with it, so they're willing to hurt their own constituents and the entire country just to try to keep our President from doing the job he was overwhelmingly elected to do.

The American people should be outraged and demand that this shutdown end now and that Congress lift the debt ceiling, pay our bills, and protect the good faith and credit of our Nation.

The good news is that even some Republicans are sick and tired of these childish, destructive tactics. They, like us Democrats, want to put our Federal workers back to work, to make sure they and those depending on Social Security will be paid, that all veterans

receive the services we owe them, that vulnerable women and children can get the care they need, and that our Nation will continue to remain strong.

So the American people must demand that Speaker BOEHNER bring the clean CR to the floor for a vote today. If he doesn't, then they must insist that their Representatives stand up for this country and our fellow Americans by stepping up and signing a discharge petition to end the madness.

□ 1215

#### NEGOTIATION

(Mr. KLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves 1 week into a government shutdown. That's something I hoped I would never have to say on the floor of this House. I did not want this; House Republicans did not want this; and the American people surely did not want this.

So why are we here? We're here because Democrats in the United States Senate and the President of the United States refuse to negotiate with the people's elected Representatives here in the House.

How long can their refusal to negotiate go on? All we are asking for is a conversation, Mr. Speaker. That's it. House Republicans want to sit down in good faith and work to get this government open again and to make sure that all Americans are treated fairly under the President's health care law.

My colleague from Indiana, just moments ago, pointed out that we pass bills in this House with overwhelming majorities—margins of over 100 votes, bipartisan votes—to keep important, essential services up and running. There are grounds for agreement. We just have to negotiate.

Leader REID, Mr. President, let's talk.

#### IMPACTING AMERICA'S YOUNGEST LEARNERS

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the government shutdown and its detrimental impact on Federal programs like Head Start and Impact Aid for school districts.

Instead of punishing our youngest learners through this government shutdown, our Nation needs a responsible, forward-looking fiscal policy that repairs the damage done by sequestration and the government shutdown and that allows programs like Head Start to provide the highest quality early learning opportunities to our most vulnerable children. A piecemeal approach to funding Head Start is not a real solution to this government shutdown.

This GOP majority has slashed funding for education, including Impact Aid. Impact Aid school districts have been harder hit than any other school districts as they struggle to provide quality education for the children of active military and Native American students. Due to the GOP sequester, many of these school districts have been reduced to 4-day school weeks.

This is a reckless and irresponsible way to govern. Our Nation's children and families deserve more, not less.

#### AMERICA'S VETERANS AND THE SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to continue speaking out about the human consequences of this ridiculous government shutdown. We are now one full week into this shameful display of irresponsibility.

Yesterday, I spoke with a man in my district named Joe Burton, who lives in Monmouth, Illinois. He is a decorated war hero, serving 21 years in the military. As a retired Army sergeant, Joe received the Bronze Star for his brave service in the gulf war.

But after honorably serving our Nation for so long, Joe is now worried sick about how this reckless government shutdown is going to impact him and his family. This tough guy is literally frightened about the shutdown and how it is affecting his VA disability payments. If his benefits aren't there and don't arrive, he has no idea how he will pay his bills or even how he will pay for his next meal. More than anything, he just wants to know how veterans like him across the country are going to make ends meet if we don't get this solved.

Let's stop this nonsense now and do right by Joe and the others who have served our country.

#### NO WAY TO RUN THE GOVERNMENT

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here at a time we should be celebrating the many freedoms bestowed upon us, but I am here in the midst of some Republicans crippling us.

It is fatal for the Congress to overlook the urgency of the moment and to underestimate the desires of the American people who want the doors of government open, ending the whirlwinds of piecemeal, cherry-picking funding.

Paraphrasing Martin Luther King: When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir.

Instead, citizens are sitting at home, waiting for Congress to open the doors

of government because bills are due, mortgage payments, rent, car loans, services are needed. So I request the Republican leadership to end this debate, because the American people are asking Congress to let them get back to work so they can cash their checks.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way to run the government.

#### ACCESS TO QUALITY CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Instead of approving the Senate-passed funding bill, House Republicans have placed politics before people while important decisions on government funding and the debt ceiling await votes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with excitement to express my support for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which has already significantly improved health care for Americans. In my State of Texas, families have saved \$46.3 million in insurance company refunds. Medicare beneficiaries in the doughnut hole have saved \$420.7 million in prescription drugs. More than 40,000 Americans and 17 million American children with preexisting conditions gained insurance coverage through the Affordable Care Act. Because of the health insurance marketplaces, in my district, about 204,000 individuals will have access to quality, affordable health care coverage.

The Affordable Care Act will grow stronger and expand access to quality care for all Americans.

#### UNDERMINING CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, the last thing Congress needs is more special interest candidates who don't answer to the American people; and yet this morning, the Senate minority leader and his big money allies in the Republican Party once again asked the Supreme Court to give billionaires more influence on public policy through our elections. If this effort succeeds, individuals would be permitted to give as much as \$3.5 million each to candidates and parties next year in addition to the already unlimited amounts they can spend independently.

It should go without saying that the number of people who are able to contribute on this scale is minuscule, but the ranks of those who would be affected by this deluge of money cannot be overstated. It is simply not possible to turn up the volume on the already amplified voices of a few wealthy donors without drowning out the millions of Americans already struggling to be heard.

The fact is we will never have a fair and balanced budget or a more equitable tax system while the well off and well connected are allowed to control Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the Republic the Framers intended. When they created Congress and when the people approved the 17th Amendment, appointing themselves the electors of the Senate, they wanted to ensure government was accountable to the people it serves. The more we undermine campaign finance laws, the further we get from that fundamental principle.

#### EVEN ONE MORE DAY IS TOO LONG

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown has affected more than just the government. We all need to understand that.

Yesterday, I learned that a veteran-owned small business in my district that contracts with the Navy has had to furlough its workers; but because they are not Federal employees, they won't be receiving backpay when the government resumes full operations. The lost pay will have a terrible impact on these employees and their families, but their absence is also seriously affecting the financial well-being of the small business that employs them.

Let's think about this: How often is this happening throughout the country? And you begin to see how San Diego, alone, is losing \$7 million a week during the shutdown. How much longer are we going to play political games when everyone is guaranteed to lose?

For our communities, for our economy, and, most of all, for those who are out of work, even one more day is too long. Let's fund the whole government and end this shutdown.

#### "CRUZ CONTROL"

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the Republicans have shut down the government. They have shut the whole thing down. Their 2-year-old plan to shut down the government over the Affordable Care Act is as harmful as it is fruitless.

However, all is not lost. The Republican shutdown can end today if the Speaker would simply disengage the "Cruz control" and hold a vote on a clean bill. This is day 8 of the government shutdown. With the debt ceiling vote looming, this is the time for action, not talk.

You can't negotiate with a Republican Party stuck on "Cruz control" on something so basic as a clean bill to reopen our government. Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues have deter-

mined that fealty to extreme Tea Party groups is more important than the needs of the people they represent.

It's time to end the stubborn, unreasonable, and mean-spirited obsession with killing the Affordable Care Act. The Republican shutdown can end today if only the Speaker would allow a vote.

#### FALLEN HEROES AND FAMILIES ASSISTANCE ACT

(Mr. BARBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, our Nation lost five brave servicemembers in Afghanistan. Shortly after they were killed, their families were notified that our government would not pay their survivor benefits due to the shutdown. This is disgraceful and an outrage.

These servicemembers gave their lives in defense of our country. When they stepped up to defend our Nation, we promised that they and their families would be cared for. Now, due to the shutdown, we have broken and abandoned that sacred commitment.

Today, I am introducing the Fallen Heroes and Families Assistance Act, which will ensure that the promises we made to our fallen servicemembers are fulfilled. I urge its immediate consideration by the House. We must honor our commitments to our fallen heroes and their families.

#### ECONOMIC HARM OF THE SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this Republican shutdown and their threats not to pay America's bills are not only reckless, but they're playing with economic fire. Their irresponsibility is burning the American people.

There are currently more than 800,000 Federal employees out of work, with thousands already filing for unemployment benefits because they've been furloughed by the GOP shutdown. These are working men and women who have to pay their bills, their mortgages, their car loans.

The Republican shutdown is harming the whole economy. The Dow Jones Industrial Average went down another 136 points yesterday and has been down nearly 200 points during the course of this Republican shutdown. It is currently at its lowest levels in a month.

Global markets continue to slide due to the uncertainty that the Republican shutdown has caused. According to news reports, it has already cost us over \$2 billion because of the shutdown, and it is hurting U.S. trade because inspections of imports and applications for exports can't be cleared by agencies like the EPA due to the fact that the staff in charge has been furloughed.

Mr. Speaker, it is well over time to bring up a clean continuing resolution

for a vote. End this needless Republican shutdown, which is not only hurting the American people, but the entire economy.

#### SBA GRINDS TO A HALT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the economic disruption caused by the Republican-orchestrated shutdown continues to mount. The negative impact on the lives of the American people and the loss of jobs and opportunities continues to rise.

As one example, in my home district of New York, the shutdown is hitting some small business owners really hard because it brought to an absolute halt any work of the Small Business Administration. On average, the Small Business Administration approves over 9 million loans in my district alone for small businesses each month, but because of this shutdown, zero. Zero are being approved—small business loans, real estate or equipment loans, and this has a terrible ripple effect on our economy.

It was bad enough that the majority would not bring a single meaningful jobs bill, infrastructure or transportation bill to the floor for a vote to create jobs; but now, this reckless, long-planned action to bring the work of the government to a halt, it is actively killing jobs, killing opportunity, killing hope.

Let's bring a clean budget up for a vote today and put people over politics.

□ 1230

#### DAY 8 OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, day 8 of the shutdown of the Federal Government.

What do we know, Mr. Speaker?

We know, I, you and your majority wanted the shutdown, so you win. You have no plan to end this shutdown—that's obvious—and it's no longer about ObamaCare.

But what we don't know is, who do you want to punish?

It must only be the people of this great Nation. You pass bills for show only. You know that the Senate and the President will not cherry-pick among the departments, yet you continue to pass these bills. Yet, you won't let the House vote on a clean CR to open government.

Mr. Speaker, you tell us when you've made the people of this country suffer enough. You tell us when you're satisfied with the level of anxiety and pain that you have caused. At that time, maybe you'll let us vote the clean CR

and let the people see where we all stand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Members will remember to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### HEAD START CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 84

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:*

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing all projects or activities under the Head Start Act (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families, Children and Families Services Programs".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each project or activity shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the

applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Head Start for Low-Income Children Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Head Start Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 84, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to present H.J. Res. 84, the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. This bill provides Federal funding at the current, post-sequester rate for the Head Start program, which millions of children across the country rely on to fulfill their educational and health needs.

As we work our way out of this government shutdown mess, we shouldn't let some of our most vulnerable citizens—low-income children with no recourse—suffer. In my home State of Kentucky, 20,715 kids rely on Head Start to provide a helping hand. If we don't do anything about this today, 2,800 kids in Kentucky will lose access to Head Start programs starting November 1.

This bill provides funding for Head Start at an annual rate of \$7.586 billion. This funding will help reopen the doors to the more than 1,600 Head Start programs across the country. As before, the funding will last until Decem-

ber 15 or until we enact full-year appropriations.

This is another step the House is taking to alleviate the burden of this current fiscal dilemma and move us closer to ending the government shutdown.

The nine bills the House has passed since October 1 to reopen the government—this will be the 10th—constitute nearly one-third of the Federal Government's discretionary budget. These 10 bills fund very critical programs, cleanly, as the Senate has demanded, and have been supported on a bipartisan basis in this House.

So why are these bills still sitting on HARRY REID's desk?

Why is the Senate not making every stride it can to help our Nation's disadvantaged children, hungry families, and our veterans?

This method of funding the government is not my preferred way, Mr. Speaker, nor is it the standard, but while we work to find an end to the shutdown, we should fund those programs we can as soon as we can.

I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will take this opportunity to meet us at the negotiating table. We've got a great deal to work out, but this can't be done if we are not willing to talk and listen to each other.

It is the time-honored way, Mr. Speaker. When the two bodies disagree on something, each body passes a bill, and we send it to conference with the other body. That's what should be done here.

In fact, this body, several days ago now, appointed conferees on this topic and sent it over to the Senate, only to be met by a loud snore.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want us to get together and talk about ending this shutdown. Though I wish we were able to end the shutdown in its entirety, this bill will at least reopen one indispensable government program and lessen the toll that the shutdown is taking on the American people.

This Congress is facing a great deal of difficult choices in the near future, but taking care of our children should be a top priority. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown. I wish my Republican colleagues had shown this same level of concern for Head Start earlier in the year when the majority proposed to slash the Labor-HHS spending bill by 22 percent. The majority did not have the courage of their convictions to stand behind their cuts and even release a copy of their bill.

Today's bill does nothing to help families afford child care or to invest in other pre-K services that are so important for children's development.

Even if House Republicans' piecemeal bills were enacted, at the rate they're going, it will take until after Christmas before the government is fully up

and running. The Republican plan is completely irresponsible.

We could end the shutdown today if the Speaker allowed a vote. Democrats have negotiated, and we didn't just meet in the middle. We agreed to the Republican spending level in the stop-gap bill, but Republicans insist on repealing the Affordable Care Act, including allowing insurance companies to deny care to children.

Vote "no" on this bill. Demand the House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), who is the chair of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly thank the chairman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I strongly support the Head Start program, and I am so hopeful that the House will pass this bill today and, certainly, that the United States Senate will take it up as well.

Head Start is a program that helps American children get the extra help that they need at an early age. I'll tell you, you can talk to any mother or grandmother. You don't need some scientific study to tell you that this program, an early intervention, is absolutely critical to making sure that every child can optimize their individual potential and to achieve their own opportunities.

During this shutdown, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about ObamaCare, but this bill has nothing to do with ObamaCare, absolutely zero to do with ObamaCare. This bill is about America's children, about Head Start. There are no strings attached. It just funds Head Start.

Now, I know that many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that they can't support any funding bill unless they get exactly what they want, which is an entire continuing resolution to finance the entire government. They want exactly what they want, otherwise they can't do this kind of a thing. And yet, it is interesting to note that they call Republicans "absolutists."

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, many others on the other side of the aisle will support this funding bill for Head Start, as they have supported these other funding bills that we have been passing since the beginning of the shutdown, in a bipartisan way.

President Obama and the Senate majority leader keep saying that they will not negotiate, but I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker that they will negotiate and that we can go to a conference committee, that we can work out our differences, that we can stop the shutdown, because to just keep saying, as the President keeps saying and the Senate Majority Leader keeps saying, that they will not negotiate on funding

the government and they will not negotiate on raising the debt ceiling, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is a proper way forward. Certainly, on issues like American children, we can put politics aside.

□ 1245

Mrs. LOWEY. Before I yield to my next speaker, I would like to make it clear that we negotiated a spending bill. We took the Republican number. Let us pass that spending bill. Speaker BOEHNER should bring it to the floor at your number and then raise the debt ceiling. Then there is plenty of time to negotiate on all the outstanding issues.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I join the National Head Start Association in opposing this bill.

At a time when our Nation's at-risk families are suffering on multiple levels due to sequestration and the Republican government shutdown, a piecemeal approach like this one is not in anyone's best interest. This disingenuous Republican effort would selectively fund some education programs while failing to provide funding for others that poor children and their families rely on.

The National School Lunch Program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Title I, after-school, special education, and rural education programs, among others, are all left out of this bill. It's unconscionable that our Nation's most vulnerable children are being denied Head Start services because of Speaker BOEHNER's refusal to bring to the floor a clean bill to open the government.

Let's stop this charade of pitting seniors against children, veterans against families, one group of Americans against another. Let's open the government and serve all our countrymen.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. YODER. I thank the chairman from Kentucky for his work on this legislation to help provide funding for Head Start kids to have an opportunity to realize all the opportunities that life presents.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask us to work together and set aside our differences for the good of the American people.

We are divided. We have an ongoing dispute about whether Congress should receive special treatment and whether individuals should be given the same exemptions that businesses have been given under the Affordable Care Act. That is in dispute.

Why can't we go forward with legislation and policies and things that we all agree on? The Senate has a position and the House has a position, and we can go on and on with this debate about whether we should fund special

treatment for Congress, businesses, and labor unions under ObamaCare; but there are unnecessary casualties to that debate.

Today, we have an opportunity to take Head Start off the table—a program that serves 1,146,468 kids nationwide; and 1,436 of these young students are in Kansas' Third District. These vulnerable students need our help. These are kids with little opportunity, disadvantaged by poverty and circumstances that put them behind from day one. Head Start for low-income children is a ray of hope, coming at a critical time when these young learners are developing their young minds.

Head Start works for students, Head Start works for families, and Head Start works for the American taxpayer. So why can't we come to an agreement as to the funding for this portion of government? We can't come to it for every portion—we get that—but we are in agreement that this shutdown is unnecessary and that we can fund Head Start today.

For some, this is a philosophical debate, but for the young learners at Head Start of Shawnee Mission, Kansas; Olathe, Kansas; or the Children's Campus in Kansas City, these are real lives and real futures at stake. They are counting on us. Surely we can take our partisan hats off for a moment and fund a bill to get each of these kids a chance to succeed.

Let's pass a clean bill that funds Head Start today. Let's put aside our differences. Let's find common ground. We have the power today to take Head Start kids out of this debate and ensure their funding.

Let's show the American people that today, on this issue, on these kids, there is no disagreement.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) control the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlewoman from New York, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States of America has now been closed for a full week. People are out of work. Some are even going hungry. Our economy is poised on the brink of a disastrous default, and yet this Republican majority continues to play political games with the future of our country and the lives and health of American families.

The hostage being negotiated today is Head Start, one of the true American success stories. Unquestionably, it is the most effective early childhood development program ever developed, and I've heard so often from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about how unsuccessful the program is and what a terrible program it is and that we ought to cut it.

For almost 50 years now, Head Start has provided comprehensive childhood development, literacy, and family services to nearly 30 million preschoolers from low-income and working families. It now serves nearly 1 million children every year. It's an example of how dedicated teachers, with the help of a smart Federal investment, can enrich the lives of our citizens—the cornerstone of our efforts to close the achievement gap—combat poverty, and provide all kids with the opportunity to thrive.

It is another important Federal program that Republicans are claiming to support today in full defiance of their previous voting record. It is as if the majority expects that we have all forgotten the positions they have been promoting for years—up to this point. We have not forgotten.

I am the ranking member of the subcommittee that oversees Head Start funding, and I have had to continually fight tooth and nail to see this program adequately funded and to protect it from the deep cuts put forward by the majority.

In 2011, the very first bill the Republican majority passed tried to cut Head Start by over a billion dollars; and 218,000 kids would have been cut from the rolls, 16,000 classrooms closed, and 55,000 teachers, assistants, and staff would have lost their jobs.

That was the majority's opening offer, and they didn't blink an eye. Parent, teachers, and advocates stood up and said "no" to these cuts, and the majority had to back down.

Instead, what they're doing now would be automatic cuts, the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration, which was never meant to become law. They're using that to do their work for them. Because of those cuts, this majority has voted to make permanent that 57,000 students all across America have already lost access to Head Start. Even the children who are able to remain in Head Start can expect shortened school days, elimination of home visits, and teacher layoffs. In total, 78,000 children have lost access to this early learning since this House majority took office, and those sequester cuts will grow worse over time.

This is a self-inflicted government shutdown. Head Start centers are being forced to close. The longer the majority perpetuates this shutdown, the more kids are being denied an opportunity to learn.

I'm happy to see my colleagues on the other side of the aisle embrace the importance of early childhood education. President Obama has called for universal preschool, which would make a profound and positive difference for children and their families across the country; but this Republican majority turned its back on that proposal, walked away from it, and didn't even consider it.

Let's stop playing games with people's lives, their health, and our children's future. It is little wonder that,

according to the latest polls, a full 70 percent of the country opposes this hostage-taking and wants us to get back to work.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe what I just heard. The gentlelady was describing the importance of the Head Start program in glowing terms, and yet she turns around and tells us she's going to vote against funding for the Head Start program. That's a puzzle to me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, we all know that we're 8 days into this Tea Party Republican government shutdown with \$2.4 billion in lost economic activity. This hostage-taking continues.

The Tea Party Republicans continue to want to deny millions of Americans health care. That's why this shutdown continues, and the public knows this.

Because of the devastating sequester, already more than 57,000 students have lost their Head Start spots. At the same time, the Tea Party Republicans insisted on cutting food stamps by \$40 billion for these same children.

So you can't tell me that today they care about these kids when they fight to cut Head Start and every other program for young people in the Appropriations Committee.

The National Head Start Association doesn't buy this very sinister approach, which will not reopen the government. They know that there are enough votes to open the government up if Speaker BOEHNER brings the Senate budget bill to the floor.

Also, let me just say many Democrats did not want the funding level of the Senate budget bill, but compromised just to get the government open.

Let's shut down this shutdown.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the chairman of the full committee, the National Head Start Association has said—I'm commenting on this sham of a bill before the House today—that they are opposed to this effort because they realize that it is a charade. I think it's important to note that. They are certainly committed—and have been for years—in terms of early-learning education and education for our children, but they, too, understand what is happening here today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is now the second week of the Republican shutdown of our government—shut down because they want to put insurance companies back in charge of America's health care.

Republicans in the House think they can get out of this horrible mess they created by partially opening one part of the government or another. Today, it's Head Start—a program I strongly support and one that used to be supported on a bipartisan basis to provide education, health and nutrition services to at-risk children.

When Republicans voted to shut down the government, they closed the doors on thousands of these children and their families. After several bad news articles about the Republicans shutting down Head Start, they now want to partially open it.

Keep in mind, restoring funding to Head Start only serves a small percentage of at-risk children who need preschool and are eligible for it. It is not enough to restore one set of early-learning services for at-risk children but to not fund the Child Care and Development Block Grant, special education services, and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, which provides early childhood services for children from low-income families as well.

If the Republicans are serious about supporting early childhood education, we should vote on the clean, Senate-passed budget to reopen the government so that services for those kids and their families can be fully restored.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. We should have that vote today.

It's time to stop the Republican shutdown. I call on the Speaker to let us vote. Let us vote. Let us vote on a bill to open the whole government.

As of today, enough Republicans have publicly stated that they're ready to join all of the Democrats to vote to open the government. Republicans should allow the House to vote on the Senate bill—a bill that was negotiated by the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, and the leader of the Senate, Mr. REID, but was rejected by the Republican caucus.

Bring that bill to the floor. Let us vote, and let these children get these services.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a quote from the National Head Start Association:

The proposed Head Start for Low-Income Children Act, while attempting to provide a funding extension for Head Start, does not put forward a true solution to the government shutdown.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).



□ 1300

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the definition of “farce” is: a foolish show, mockery, a ridiculous sham.

Now, this Head Start funding bill and cry for providing a head start for our low-income children is indeed a false start at this 22 percent sequestration level. The politicians’ mantra that education is the key does not pass the laugh test where our babies are locked out and out of luck—no LIHEAP, immunizations, disability education assistance. This is a key to what—a key to a government careening toward default? It is a government that has defaulted on the future of our children.

Let’s shut down the shutdown.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to read a headline from Connecticut’s Hartford Courant: “Head Start Memo: Nearly 1,000 Children Shut Out.”

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

You will find no stronger supporter of the Head Start program than I. For years, I worked first as a teacher in Head Start, and later I was a supervisor for Parent Involvement and Volunteer Services.

I know Head Start. The experience was life changing—inspiring me to join the war on poverty and dedicate myself to improving the lives of low-income children and families. Thanks to Head Start, thousands of children have been put on a solid path to a well-rounded education.

Head Start teaches children to feel good about themselves, to have a positive self-image. Head Start introduced children to books and reading and to how to resolve conflicts. We gave full examination and discovered educational disabilities, and we gave them the path to good health services.

The opposite side of the aisle claims they support Head Start and early childhood education, but they supported sequestration that has robbed 57,000 children of the opportunity to be in the Head Start program.

This Republican destructive strategy—picking winners and losers, who will survive and who will not—is not the right way to go.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WATERS. Put a clean CR on the floor so that we can vote for all of government to be protected. Don’t pit children against veterans, et cetera.

I will not be bullied into supporting this measure. I urge my colleagues to stand with me. Despite my love for this program, I must vote against this measure.

I ask my colleagues to stand up to these Republican tricks and vote “no.”

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am really puzzled. We hear speaker after speaker on the other side tell us how committed they are to these poor children in the Head Start program, and yet here’s the chance, Mr. Speaker, to continue this program. Yes, it does not include the entire government, but are we going to hold hostage these kids from poor families who are desperate for this program. Are we going to hold them hostage, or are we going to go ahead and approve this short-term funding for the Head Start program?

If you believe in Head Start, it seems to me you would stand in the well and say: I support this bill because it continues the Head Start program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just comment for a moment in that I think that it is not a question of holding these children hostage. You are holding the entire Nation hostage for an effort that is not going to change, and that is: the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land.

Let’s have a vote on this floor of the House of Representatives. We can reopen this government and not hold anyone hostage any longer.

If my memory serves me well, in 2011, the gentleman, whom I do have great respect for, voted for H.R. 1—and maybe it was his bill that he passed—which would have cut Head Start by over \$1 billion.

It is puzzling to me that all of a sudden my Republican colleagues have gotten religion on the Head Start program. It is so inconsistent with where this majority has been with regard to Head Start and so disingenuous and duplicitous that we know it is a political ploy.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Republican shutdown is a disaster for families across America and this great country, and we are not fooled by this political gimmick on the floor today. It is a gimmick; it is a gimmick; it is a gimmick.

The Republican position in this Congress, as demonstrated in their budget, has been to slash support for Head Start students. I know this; Head Start parents know this; Head Start teachers know this; and our communities back home know it all too well. In fact, in the House Budget Committee just this past March, Democrats offered an amendment to eliminate the severe Republican cuts to education and Head Start students and to stop the layoffs of teachers. Republicans scoffed, just like they are scoffing at their basic responsibility to negotiate and pass a budget and keep government working.

Mr. Speaker, when you shut down Head Start classrooms, did you know that the parents of these students may not be able to go to work or keep their jobs? That is not smart. Head Start keeps parents working or studying for

their own degree so they can move out of poverty into the middle class.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the gentlewoman 10 seconds.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. So I urge Speaker BOEHNER to bring a clean bill to the floor that funds the U.S. Government, not these political gimmicks.

Enough of the gimmicks. We know we have 200 Democrats ready to support a clean CR and at least 20 or so Republicans. End these political gimmicks. Fund the government. End this calamity for American families.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I think the best way to resolve this debate is to ask a simple factual question.

There are two approaches here. The majority approach wants to pass this piecemeal bill. We want—“we,” meaning the entire Democratic Caucus and enough Republicans to pass it—we want to take up the Senate clean bill and vote on it now.

Which of these two approaches would provide the most help most quickly to the Head Start centers across the country? Which would really help the program?

If this bill passes, it will languish in the current political turmoil and go nowhere. If the Speaker puts on the floor the clean Senate continuing resolution, it will pass this afternoon, and the Head Start centers that are afflicted by this problem all over the country will open tomorrow morning.

If you care about helping the Head Start program, you will vote in favor of the Senate bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because I actually think Head Start is an important program, and I’ve supported it. I’ve seen and I’ve gone to Head Starts throughout my district and have read to the kids who are there. The reforms that were done that made it more of an educational preschool type of atmosphere—that was done, gee, I don’t know, probably about 7 or 8 years ago—I think actually helped improve Head Start, making sure that children are ready when they start regular K-12. So I support this.

This is important, and in this atmosphere where it is all or nothing and no negotiations—we’re not going to talk to you—we are left doing these micro or minivan-type bills in which we take the most important, essential programs and say, you know, we agree with you that Head Start is a worthwhile program and that it’s worth

funding. So why don't we just work together and agree that we will fund Head Start at the budget level.

I heard comments earlier about some Republicans wanted to cut it, and yes, there are going to be some that do. So if you think that it's that cynical, call us on it. Vote for it. You want Head Start to continue, and you think we're being cynical with this? Call us on it. Vote for it.

Let's send a bipartisan measure over to the Senate, and force them to vote for it. What's the worst thing that's going to happen? Oh, Head Start gets funded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleague who just spoke, vote for it. Let's take the bill that was passed in the Senate, bring it here. There are apparently enough votes to reopen this government. Vote for it.

Why be afraid of the process? That's what we do here—we vote. Bring the bill here. Let's open it up and take our chances. What are we afraid of? What are we afraid of? Are we afraid that, in fact, some Republicans will join all of the Democrats to pass a bill that reopens the Federal Government and protects these children, protects our veterans, protects our workers, protects everyone? There is just a fear and a loathing here which I truly do not understand.

With regard to Head Start and other early childhood education programs, we know what those economic dividends are. It's about productivity; it's about prosperity; but it's about the quality of their lives and their futures. That's what "Head Start" means.

Given the record of this majority and its past actions in cutting funding over and over and over again for Head Start, it just proves how disingenuous this gimmick is here today. They're playing to the crowd, but the crowd isn't listening. No one will forget what you have done.

In fact, Head Start graduates are less likely to need special education services, to be left back a grade, or to get into trouble with the law. They're more likely to go on to college and to have a professional career. It is a program, yes, that works wonders, which is why we've all been surprised and dismayed by our Republicans and their attempts to slash this funding in the past.

May I ask the gentleman if he has any additional speakers or if he is going to close?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am dismayed, but we are all dismayed. We have fought these battles on Head Start in the committee. As to the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, who sits on the Labor-HHS Subcommittee, we fought over and over and over again in talking about how important this program is; and day after day after day after day, we have been told that the facts belie themselves, that this is not a successful program, that kids aren't learning. They have dug up studies from 20 years ago to tell us that this program doesn't work. All of a sudden, today, they think that there is merit in Head Start?

I hope this extends to what the President has asked for in universal early childhood education. Do you know that the Labor-HHS Subcommittee never even saw a markup, nor did they ever mention, with their draft proposal, early childhood education? They dismissed the President's view of early childhood education and providing universal early education for kids; and now, today, they stand before this body and this Nation and say they support this effort.

Let me just tell you, this is more of the reason why the hostage-taking by the majority has to end. Every day, we waste time with these gimmicks mortgages our kids' futures and our future as a Nation. It's not responsible governing, and it's time for it to end.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1315

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard here today what we have heard in the last several days from the other side—that they will not vote for any of these individual bills because we are not bringing the entire continuing resolution before the House.

But let me point out: with this bill—the 10th in this series that we brought out in a so-called piecemeal fashion—it will take us to about a third of the CR, the original continuing resolution. So we are passing the continuing resolution one piece at a time, but nevertheless we are passing a continuing resolution.

To say that I am not going to vote for this bill because you don't have all of the bills before us doesn't have much logic to it. It means that every bill that comes before the House could be argued the same way: I won't vote for that bill because it doesn't fund whatever or enact whatever piece of legislation that is waiting in the wings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is about Head Start. It is not about health care; it is not about procedure; it is not about whether or not this is piecemeal or full, or what have you. It is about Head Start. If you believe in the Head Start program and the hundreds of thousands of young children in this country—and families—that are depending on this

program, it seems to me you would lay everything else aside and vote for that program, which I am asking our Members to do as I close.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for Head Start and my opposition to this legislation, which locks in the automatic cuts to funding for this critical program.

A high-quality early education puts children on a path to succeed academically and in life. Decades of research and data show that investments in high-quality early education help close the achievement gap, increase high school graduation rates, and reduce the need for special education. These investments also lower the rates of criminal activity and dependence on public assistance. In fact, one study found that for every dollar invested in high-quality early education, taxpayers saved \$7 in other costs.

When first entering school, a child's health, emotional well-being, and social surroundings are all factors in their ability to succeed academically. Head Start recognizes this and, in turn, merges literacy and math activities with access to vision screenings and other basic health care services.

Additionally, the program brings parents into the development process by providing them with support services in and out of the home, such as access to social workers, peer counseling, and parenting programs.

In my state of Pennsylvania, Head Start centers serve more than 37,000 children, but now, this unnecessary government shutdown threatens this important program. Already, Head Start programs in six states have been shuttered as a result of the federal government shutdown. This is unacceptable.

Instead of playing games, House Republicans should join Democrats in finding a solution to this shutdown. It is time pass a clean CR, reopen the government, and allow all children access to early education.

Our nation deserves better. Our children deserve better.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.J. Res 84, Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. Head Start represents an innovative idea from a Democratic led Congress that was created for the education of our smallest citizens who come from poor or low income households.

We know that if these children have an early start in education it levels the playing field of life and they can have an equal opportunity to succeed.

Families in my district who rely on Federal Government programs like Head Start are hurting. The pain did not start with the shutdown, but with sequestration which hit Head Start programs for 3 to 4 year olds in the Houston Area hard: \$5,341 million dollar cut, 109 employees cut, 699 slots for children cut.

On October 2, I joined hundreds of Head Start supporters from across the country and many of my colleagues to protest the closing of Head Start programs due to the Federal Government shutdown.

I picked up one of the tiny blue chairs that represented the thousands of Head Start children from around the nation and said that an empty Head Start chair represents a future doctor, engineer, president, or teacher who is at risk because of the Federal Government shutdown.

My support of Head Start and Early Head Start is based on what I have seen and heard about programs like the AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start program serving parents and children in the 18th Congressional District.

The AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start is a program serving low income families in my Houston Texas District.

I visited with AVANCE-Houston administrators earlier this month because I wanted to get an update on how low-income families with infants and toddlers and pregnant women served by the program were doing.

The AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start's mission is simple. AVANCE-Houston works for healthy prenatal outcomes for pregnant women, enhance the development of very young children, and promote healthy family functioning.

AVANCE-Houston serves nearly 1,800 children city wide. Each of these families and their children are suffering the effect of the legislative malpractice of the House majority.

The sequestration has cost Head Start and Early Head Start: AVANCE-Houston lost \$842,518.

The impact to the AVANCE-Houston Head Start employees, teachers and administrators of the first wave of lost funds were: Furlough days, hiring freeze, extra workloads, morale level, outsource of custodial services.

In Houston, Head Start families and their children saw a reduction of days of operation; increase concerns about loss of services for their children and Hardy Center closure

AVANCE-Houston absorbed the sequestration reduction in federal funds by:

Reducing enrollment by 3.3% which ended access to the program for 72 children; Eliminating 11 Early Head Start and 9 Head Start Teachers and Support staff, and 12 custodial positions; and

AVANCE-Houston facing a Federal Government shutdown now must consider what it might mean to their future:

Possible loss of services for an already under-served population;

Increased costs of operation—Lease cost, building maintenance, medical insurance rates, unemployment, and worker's comp;

Maintenance of competitive salaries;

High staff turnover;

Limited dollars for new initiatives/curriculum.

I know many of my colleagues on the other side of aisle speak about reforming malpractice lawsuit rights of victims, but what the public is seeing in the legislative malpractice of my colleagues in the majority.

When there are no perceived consequences for bad behavior or harm caused to another there are no incentives to stop the bad behavior.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is legislative malpractice because it does not address the earlier cuts to Federal Government employees and programs caused by sequestration and makes worse an already bad financial situation for our government's most important assets—Federal workers.

The importance of Federal workers and the critical programs or services they administer like Head Start in our Congressional Districts cannot be understated.

The Houston Chronicle reported that due to sequestration it had already caused Head Start children and their parents pain.

This school year, a parent Marlen Rosas hoped her 3-year-old son, Hector, would be

attending Head Start so that he might learn English.

Her modest hopes for her son were that he would eventually earn the high school diploma she never had the opportunity to earn.

But when Ms. Rosas went to enroll Hector—even though he met all the qualifications for the federal Head Start program—Hector was turned down.

Ms. Rosas said, "I'm sad because he wanted to go to school," Rosas said through an interpreter. "He only speaks Spanish, and that would be one of the advantages: for him to socialize with those who speak English, while learning the names of colors and numbers—just to be learning."

A couple made a contribution of \$10 million to open Head Start Programs in 11 states for 7,000 kids from low-income families could continue to receive educational services. I commend this couple for their generosity of heart to assist some of the Head Start Children impacted by this curl majority led Federal Government shutdown.

The legislative malpractice of representing to the American public that the Federal Government is comprised of dismembered parts that can be funded without regard for what one part does or how one agency contributes to the work of other agencies.

It is like building a car with no regard for what a part does and how it would function when installed—because the purpose of car is transportation.

The purpose of the House of Representatives is to fund the Federal Government—what we are doing will not accomplish the outcome.

Those who control the House of Representatives is making a cruel tragedy out of the budget process by teasing Federal employees who watch while the House majority toy with their lives by passing one funding bill at a time.

Mr. Speaker, the majority should stop playing games with the American public and pass the clean funding bill from the Senate that would fund the entire Federal Government including all programs immediately.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 84, the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act.

Since its inception in 1965, Head Start has served over 30 million children and their families. The program's purpose has always been to serve children and pregnant women in centers, family homes, and in family child care homes in urban, suburban, and rural communities throughout our nation.

Last year, California Head Start received over \$900 million in federal funding and taught over 111,000 children. In California, there are almost 23,000 Head Start employees serving children and their families.

My rural, low-income district relies heavily on the Head Start Program. Without it, families across the Central Valley would be unable to ensure proper care and early education of their young children.

Just last week, two of my constituents flew across the country to appeal to me and my California colleagues on the devastating impacts of this drawn-out shutdown on the Head Start Program.

After passage, this bill would provide immediate funding for the nation's Head Start program at the same rate and under the same conditions as were in effect last year ensuring that Head Start programs across the country

will be able to keep providing education, health, nutrition and additional services to our 1 million enrolled children and their families.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to H.J. Res. 84, the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. While I appreciate the concern for the harmful effects of the shutdown on Head Start and am deeply troubled by the children cut off from Head Start services, I am unable to support this funding bill. A far better approach to undoing the damage caused by this shutdown is to pass a clean continuing resolution, CR, that funds the entire government.

On the heels of devastating sequester cuts which caused more than 57,000 children to lose their Head Start slots—over 4,000 of whom live in Texas—this shutdown continues to harm even more of America's most vulnerable families. Already, thousands of children have been affected by Head Start program closures and reduced services due to a lack of federal support from this crisis and thousands more children are at risk of losing their seats in classrooms as the shutdown continues.

However, this piecemeal approach to funding Head Start fails to provide America's children with the same support as a fully operational government through a clean CR. The populations served by Head Start often rely on many other vital programs that provide critical assistance to students who are most in need, such as the National School Lunch Program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), special education programs, and Title I programs, none of which are included in this funding bill.

The implication of students losing vital classroom time, nutrition, and instruction is severe and only makes the mission of improving student achievement and closing achievement gaps that much more difficult.

I urge my colleagues to immediately pass a clean CR and reopen the full government so we can put an end to the current political stalemate and bring the focus back on undoing the harmful effects of the sequester.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.J. Res 84, Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. Head Start represents an innovative idea from a Democratic led Congress that was created for the education of our smallest citizens who come for poor or low income households.

We know that if these children have an early start in education it levels the playing field of life and they can have an equal opportunity to succeed.

Families in my district who rely on Federal Government programs like Head Start are hurting. The pain did not start with the shutdown, but with Sequestration which hit Head Start programs for 3 to 4 year olds in the Houston Area hard: \$5,341 million Dollar cut; 109 Employees cut; 699 Slots for children cut.

On October 2, I joined hundreds of Head Start supporters from across the country and many of my colleagues to protest the closing of Head Start programs due to the Federal government shutdown.

I picked up one of the tiny blue chairs that represented the thousands of Head Start children from around the nation and said that an empty Head Start chair represents a future doctor, engineer, president, or teacher who is at risk because of the Federal Government shutdown.

My support of Head Start and Early Head Start is based on what I have seen and heard

about programs like the AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start program serving parents and children in the 18th Congressional District.

The AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start is a program serving low income families in my Houston Texas District.

I visited with AVANCE-Houston administrators earlier this month because I wanted to get an update on how low-income families with infants and toddlers and pregnant women served by the program were doing.

The AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start's mission is simple. AVANCE-Houston works for healthy prenatal outcomes for pregnant women, enhance the development of very young children, and promote healthy family functioning.

AVANCE-Houston serves nearly 1,800 children city wide. Each of these families and their children are suffering the effect of the legislative malpractice of the House majority.

The Sequestration has cost Head Start and Early Head Start: AVANCE-Houston lost \$842,518.

The impact to the AVANCE-Houston Head Start employees, teachers and administrators of the first wave of lost funds were: furlough days; Hiring Freeze; Extra workloads; Morale level; Outsource of custodial services.

In Houston, Head Start families and their children saw a reduction of days of operation; increase concerns about loss of services for their children and Hardy Center closure.

AVANCE-Houston absorbed the Sequestration reduction in federal funds by: Reducing enrollment by 3.3 percent which ended access to the program for 72 children; Eliminating ii Early Head Start and 9 Head Start Teachers and Support staff; and 12 custodial positions.

AVANCE-Houston facing a Federal Government shutdown now must consider what it might mean to their future: Possible loss of services for an already underserved population; Increased costs of operation-Lease cost, building maintenance, medical insurance rates, unemployment, and worker's comp; Maintenance of competitive salaries; High staff turnover; Limited dollars for new initiatives/curriculum.

I know many of my colleagues on the other side of aisle speak about reforming malpractice lawsuit rights of victims, but what the public is seeing in the legislative malpractice of my colleagues in the majority.

When there are no perceived consequences for bad behavior or harm caused to another there are no incentives to stop the bad behavior.

Mr. Speaker this bill is legislative malpractice because it does not address the earlier cuts to Federal government employees and programs caused by Sequestration and makes worse an already bad financial situation for our government's most important assets—Federal workers.

The importance of Federal workers and the critical programs or services they administer like Head Start in our Congressional Districts cannot be understated.

The Houston Chronicle reported that due to sequestration had already caused Head Start children and their parents pain: This school year, a parent Marlen Rosas hoped her 3-year-old son, Hector, would be attending Head Start so that he might learn English; Her modest hopes for her son were that he would eventually earn the high school diploma she never had the opportunity to earn; But when

Ms. Rosas went to enroll Hector—even though he met all the qualifications for the federal Head Start program—Hector was turned down; Ms. Rosas said, "I'm sad because he wanted to go to school," Rosas said through an interpreter. "He only speaks Spanish, and that would be one of the advantages: for him to socialize with those who speak English, while learning the names of colors and numbers—just to be learning.

A couple made a contribution of \$10 million to open Head Start Programs in 11 states for 7,000 kids from low-income families could continue to receive educational services. I commend this couple for their generosity of heart to assist some of the Head Start Children impacted by this curl majority led Federal Government Shutdown.

The legislative malpractice of representing to the American public that the Federal government is comprised of dismembered parts that can be funded without regard for what one part does or how one agency contributes to the work of other agencies.

It is like building a car with no regard for what a part does and how it would function when installed—because the purpose of car is transportation.

The purpose of the House of Representatives is to fund the federal government—what we are doing will not accomplish the outcome.

Those who control the House of Representatives is making a cruel tragedy out of the budget process by teasing federal employees who watch while the House majority toy with their lives by passing one funding bill at a time.

Mr. Speaker, the majority should stop playing games with the American public and pass the clean funding bill from the Senate that would fund the entire Federal government including all programs immediately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mrs. CAPPS. Yes, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 84 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlelady's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to speak on this topic.

I worked for decades in our Nation's public schools as a school nurse, and I saw firsthand in my community the tremendous effects that Head Start programs have for so many of our most vulnerable children.

No one is a stronger supporter of this program, but today is really not about the children of Head Start or their families. Today is about ending the childish behavior of those of the Republican leadership, who continue to stand in the way of reopening our government.

Let me be clear: we are here today because one faction of one party in one House of Congress has shut down the United States Government because they don't like one law—the Affordable Care Act. This is a law that was passed by this Congress; it was affirmed by the Supreme Court; and it was a focal point of the last election in which the candidate for president who supported the law won.

But none of this matters to our Republican colleagues. Instead, they have let their obsession with repealing the Affordable Care Act bring our entire Federal Government to a screeching halt.

Mr. Speaker, this piecemeal approach pushed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reopen certain parts of the government is merely a facade. It is a "gimmick," as my colleague referred to it, giving the illusion that they are trying to fix the problem, but they are not.

Instead, we find ourselves here picking and choosing and waiting for them to decide whose lucky day it is to be funded by the Republican leadership. This is not the way to run a great Nation.

Even if we reopen Head Start programs, what about the millions of other students that benefit from programs administered by the Department of Education? What about the families who cannot get their childcare vouchers? What about the job-training programs to help the unemployed parents get back on their feet? How long do they have to wait, Mr. Speaker, until we get around to funding their programs? When is their lucky day?

We cannot continue government funding by picking programs out of a hat. If the House leadership really wanted to fix the problem, they could do so today if they would just bring a clean continuing resolution to the House floor for a straight up or down vote.

At least 25 of our Republican colleagues have publicly supported a vote for a clean continuing resolution. That

is enough votes to end the shutdown today—we know it, the Speaker knows it, and the American people know it—but we are still waiting.

Now, let me say it again: This government shutdown does not have to continue. We can end it right now.

My amendment today is the ninth time that Democrats have provided a solution to end the government shutdown. It is the only way to get a vote on the clean negotiated continuing resolution today.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take this opportunity to stop wasting time. We must reopen the government, and we must get back to our work, which is to rebuild our economy, to support our veterans, to pass a farm bill, and to address the many other challenges that this great Nation of ours faces. To do so, we need to stop playing these games.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues, including my many Republican colleagues who have called for a vote on a clean CR, to join me today and to end this charade. I urge a “yes” vote on this motion.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2, 3, 4, and 7, 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and, therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund only a portion of the Federal Government?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that all of our education programs are there for all of our children and families. Can the Chair explain, please, why it is not germane to open all of the Nation's education programs?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Kentucky makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from California are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to Head Start. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair ruled on October 2, October 3, October 4, and October 7, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not

germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds on committee jurisdiction grounds.

Therefore, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Ellmers	Kingston
Amash	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Amodei	Fincher	Kline
Bachmann	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Bachus	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Barletta	Fleming	Lamborn
Barr	Flores	Lance
Barton	Forbes	Lankford
Benish	Fortenberry	Latham
Bentivolio	Fox	Latta
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Long
Black	Gardner	Luetkemeyer
Blackburn	Garrett	Lummis
Boustany	Gerlach	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Marino
Bridenstine	Gibson	Massie
Brooks (AL)	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	McCauley
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	McClintock
Buchanan	Gosar	McHenry
Bucshon	Gowdy	McKeon
Burgess	Granger	McKinley
Calvert	Graves (GA)	McMorris
Camp	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Campbell	Griffin (AR)	Meadows
Cantor	Griffith (VA)	Meehan
Capito	Grimm	Messer
Carter	Guthrie	Mica
Cassidy	Hall	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Chaffetz	Harper	Miller, Gary
Coble	Harris	Mullin
Coffman	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Cole	Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)
Collins (GA)	Heck (NV)	Neugebauer
Collins (NY)	Hensarling	Noem
Conaway	Holding	Nugent
Cook	Hudson	Nunes
Cotton	Huelskamp	Nunnelee
Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Crawford	Hultgren	Palazzo
Crenshaw	Hunter	Paulsen
Culberson	Hurt	Pearce
Daines	Issa	Perry
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins	Petri
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
DeSantis	Jones	Poe (TX)
DesJarlais	Jordan	Pompeo
Diaz-Balart	Joyce	Posey
Duffy	Kelly (PA)	Price (GA)
Duncan (SC)	King (IA)	Radel
Duncan (TN)	King (NY)	Reed

Reichert	Schock
Renacci	Schweikert
Ribble	Scott, Austin
Rice (SC)	Sensenbrenner
Rigell	Sessions
Roby	Shimkus
Roe (TN)	Shuster
Rogers (KY)	Simpson
Rogers (MI)	Smith (MO)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)
Rokita	Smith (NJ)
Rooney	Smith (TX)
Ros-Lehtinen	Southerland
Roskam	Stewart
Ross	Stivers
Rothfus	Stockman
Royce	Stutzman
Runyan	Terry
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (PA)
Salmon	Thornberry
Sanford	Tiberi
Scalise	Tipton

NAYS—191

Andrews	Green, Al	Nolan
Barber	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Owens
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Beatty	Hahn	Pascarella
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Holt	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Horsford	Peterson
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Polis
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jeffries	Quigley
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Keating	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	T.
Chu	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kuster	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Langevin	Schiff
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Connolly	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Conyers	Levin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Lewis	Scott, David
Costa	Lipinski	Serrano
Courtney	Loeb	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Sherman
Cummings	Lowe	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lujan, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
DeGette	(NM)	Speier
Delaney	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Maffei	Takano
DelBene	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Carolyn	Tierney
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Doggett	Matheson	Tonko
Doyle	Matsui	Tsongas
Duckworth	McCollum	Van Hollen
Edwards	McDermott	Vargas
Ellison	McGovern	Veasey
Engel	McIntyre	Vela
Enyart	McNerney	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meeks	Walz
Esty	Meng	Wasserman
Farr	Michaud	Schultz
Fattah	Miller, George	Waters
Foster	Moore	Watt
Frankel (FL)	Moran	Waxman
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Gabbard	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Garcia	Neal	
Grayson	Negrete McLeod	

NOT VOTING—14

Clay	Lucas	Thompson (MS)
Gallego	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Herrera Beutler	Richmond	Whitfield
Higgins	Rogers (AL)	Young (FL)
Honda	Rush	

□ 1349

Messrs. CAPUANO and SMITH of Washington changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. YODER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 168, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

## AYES—248

Aderholt	Fleming	Luetkemeyer
Amash	Flores	Lummis
Amodei	Forbes	Lynch
Bachmann	Fortenberry	Maloney, Sean
Bachus	Foster	Marchant
Barber	Fox	Marino
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	Massie
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Matheson
Barrow (GA)	Garcia	McCarthy (CA)
Barton	Gardner	McCaul
Benish	Garrett	McClintock
Bentivolio	Gerlach	McHenry
Bera (CA)	Gibbs	McIntyre
Bilirakis	Gibson	McKeon
Bishop (UT)	Gingrey (GA)	McKinley
Black	Gohmert	McMorris
Blackburn	Goodlatte	Rodgers
Boustany	Gosar	Meadows
Brady (TX)	Gowdy	Meehan
Braley (IA)	Granger	Messer
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	Mica
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)
Broun (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary
Buchanan	Grimm	Mullin
Bucshon	Guthrie	Mulvaney
Burgess	Hall	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Hanna	Murphy (PA)
Calvert	Harper	Neugebauer
Camp	Harris	Noem
Campbell	Hartzler	Nugent
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Capito	Heck (NV)	Nunnelee
Carter	Hensarling	Olson
Cassidy	Holding	Palazzo
Chabot	Hudson	Paulsen
Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Pearce
Coble	Hultgren	Perry
Coffman	Hunter	Peters (CA)
Cole	Hurt	Peters (MI)
Collins (GA)	Issa	Peterson
Collins (NY)	Jenkins	Petri
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Cotton	Jones	Poe (TX)
Cramer	Jordan	Pompeo
Crawford	Joyce	Posey
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Price (GA)
Culberson	King (IA)	Radel
Daines	King (NY)	Rahall
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Reed
DeBene	Kinzinger (IL)	Reichert
Denham	Kline	Renacci
Dent	Labrador	Ribble
DeSantis	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Rigell
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Roby
Duffy	Lankford	Roe (TN)
Duncan (SC)	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Ellmers	Latta	Rogers (MI)
Farenthold	Lipinski	Rohrabacher
Fincher	LoBiondo	Rokita
Fitzpatrick	Loeb	Rooney
Fleischmann	Long	Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam	Simpson	Wagner
Ross	Sinema	Walberg
Rothfus	Smith (MO)	Walden
Royce	Smith (NE)	Walorski
Ruiz	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Runyan	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Southerland	Wenstrup
Salmon	Stewart	Westmoreland
Sanford	Stivers	Whitfield
Scalise	Stockman	Williams
Schneider	Stutzman	Wilson (SC)
Schock	Terry	Wittman
Schrader	Thompson (PA)	Wolf
Schweikert	Thornberry	Womack
Scott, Austin	Tiberi	Woodall
Sensenbrenner	Tipton	Yoder
Sessions	Turner	Yoho
Shimkus	Upton	Young (AK)
Shuster	Valadao	Young (IN)

## NOES—168

Andrews	Grayson	Negrete McLeod
Bass	Green, Al	Nolan
Beatty	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Becerra	Grijalva	Owens
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pallone
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Payne
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Butterfield	Horsford	Pocan
Capps	Hoyer	Polis
Capuano	Huelskamp	Price (NC)
Cardenas	Huffman	Quigley
Carney	Israel	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Sanchez, Linda
Chu	Keating	T.
Ciçilline	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kilmer	Schiff
Cohen	Kind	Schwartz
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Kuster	Scott, David
Cooper	Langevin	Serrano
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cuellar	Levin	Sires
Cummings	Lewis	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Speier
DeFazio	Lowe	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Tierney
Deutch	(NM)	Titus
Dingell	Maffei	Tonko
Doggett	Maloney,	Tsongas
Doyle	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Matsui	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Veasey
Edwards	McDermott	Vela
Ellison	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	McNerney	Walz
Enyart	Meeks	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meng	Schultz
Esty	Michaud	Waters
Farr	Miller, George	Watt
Fattah	Moore	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Moran	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Neal	

## NOT VOTING—15

Clay	Honda	Rogers (AL)
Gallego	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Gutiérrez	Lucas	Thompson (MS)
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Higgins	Richmond	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1356

So the joint resolution was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 529—Motion to Table Ruling of the Chair; and 530—Passage of H.J. Res. 84, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1520

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 89, EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3273, DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 90, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-243) on the resolution (H. Res. 373) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 89, EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3273, DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 90, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 373 and ask for its immediate consideration.



The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 373

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.J. Res. 89, the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.J. Res. 89;

(2) conform the title of H.J. Res. 89 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.J. Res. 89, H.R. 3273 shall be laid on the table.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 373 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3273, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013; H.J. Res. 89, the Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act of 2013; and H.J. Res. 90, the Flight Safety Act of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, today this body will consider three important pieces of legislation designed to address the current government shutdown and the looming debt limit. The first of these bills would appropriate the funds necessary to pay essential Federal employees who have been continuing to work during the shutdown. These men and women have earned their paychecks and deserve for us to act on their legislation to ensure that they are paid on time.

Secondly, we will consider legislation to fully fund the FAA in order to ensure that our Nation's commerce and air travel continues uninterrupted and safely. There are many, many workers of the FAA who need to come back to work to ensure the safety and to ensure that millions of American passengers in the air are not put at risk due to a continued government shutdown.

Finally, we will consider legislation to establish a bicameral, bipartisan Working Group on Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth. This working group would consist of 10 Members of the House and 10 Members of the Senate, representing six from the majority and four from the minority of both Chambers. These Members would be appointed no less than one day after the enactment of this legislation, and would each meet on the subsequent calendar day until an agreement is reached on the overall discretionary levels for fiscal year 2014; changes to the discretionary debt limit; and reforms to direct spending programs.

For nearly a month now, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have asked Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and Senate Democrats to sit down and negotiate with House Republicans. Bill after bill from House Republicans and this body have gone to the United States Senate only to be batted down or to be revised and to come back without addressing the significant problems that our country faces today.

So what we are trying to do is to find another avenue, and that is to have the House of Representatives and the United States Senate and their appointees be able to meet together in a working group to resolve these issues. What do I envision? I envision a TV would be in the room. The American people could take part in these discussions and see how much progress can be made between Senate Republicans and

Senate Democrats and House Republicans and House Democrats on these important issues, and hold those Members accountable for exactly the same thing that we're trying to do, and that is to get this government back opened up with an agreement about how we are going to fund this government.

So, today, we ask once again if the Senate is willing to join us not only as we work towards ending this government shutdown but on how we are going to address our government's debt and put our Nation back to work on the pathway to prosperity. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my good friend, for granting me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends are devolving into self-parody. The solution to this unnecessary and manufactured crisis is simple, and it hasn't changed for months:

Step one, pass a clean, short-term continuing resolution at Republican sequester levels to reopen the government;

Step two, pass a clean debt ceiling bill so that the United States will not default for the first time in history and so we don't send the economy into a tailspin;

Step three, finally agree to go to conference on the budget so we can sit down and talk about our priorities.

Let me go over that once more just in case there's any confusion on the other side of the aisle: reopen the government; raise the debt ceiling; and negotiate on the budget.

That has been what the White House and Democrats in Congress have been asking for over and over and over and over again. It's what we're asking for today, and it's what we will ask for tomorrow.

By contrast, the list of House Republican demands changes every 10 minutes: repeal ObamaCare, defund ObamaCare, delay ObamaCare, stage a non-filibuster filibuster, ask for the entire Romney economic platform in order to raise the debt ceiling, yell at park rangers, fund this part of the government, fund that part of the government, pay furloughed employees, pay essential employees, hold a conference meeting, hold a press conference, rinse and repeat.

Enough, Mr. Speaker. Enough.

Here we are again with yet another convoluted, cockamamie legislative effort that is going absolutely nowhere. We have yet another "message bill" that is designed to win today's news cycle but that gets us no closer to resolving this crisis.

Today's effort is particularly pathetic, Mr. Speaker. Instead of actually

solving the problem and letting the American people get on with their lives, the bill before us today would create that most cherished and beloved Washington institution, a committee—not just any committee, no, but another supercommittee. It's Supercommittee 2: The Wrath of Cruz.

We have before us a bill that was dreamed up—Lord knows when—floated in the press at 10 o'clock this morning, distributed as legislative language at 11:30 this morning, in the Rules Committee at 12:30, and on the floor at 3:20. Forget the 3-day rule, Mr. Speaker. This contraption barely even followed the 3-hour rule.

And the Superdupercommittee Part 2—pardon me, the “bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth”—that is created by this bill doesn't come with any instructions. There is no time line. There is no deadline. It doesn't reopen the government. It doesn't prevent a default. It doesn't do much of anything.

It's unclear whether coffee and pastries will be provided at the Superdupercommittee Part 2 working group. Maybe we need another bill to do that.

This is just another press release. Mr. Speaker, we do not need another committee to do the job that we were elected to do. Let me remind my colleagues that we have this thing called the Budget Committee, and the Republicans made a big deal about the fact that we passed a budget in the House and the Senate didn't pass a budget in the Senate. Then the Senate did pass a budget. What you're supposed to do is then go to conference and work out your differences and come up with a final product. For 6 months we have been pleading with the Speaker of the House and the Republican leadership to appoint conferees to negotiate a budget agreement. That's the way it's supposed to work. The Senate does something, we do something, and we negotiate the differences. For 6 months the Republicans have refused to appoint conferees, and now they're saying we need this kind of vague committee that has no instructions, that has no time line. It doesn't do anything to stop the government shutdown. It doesn't do anything to stop the government default on our financial obligations.

This is no way to run a railroad, let alone the United States House of Representatives. So I would urge the Republican leadership to start caring a little less about winning today's news cycle and a little more about the American people, who sent us here and who expect us to do our jobs.

Open the government. Raise the debt ceiling. Negotiate on the budget. It is really not that complicated.

In the meantime, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this closed rule, reject the underlying legislation, and reject the politics of manufactured crises.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, hot off the press this afternoon from Politico, which is not exactly a right-wing newspaper, it says:

Obama calls Boehner. Reiterates he won't negotiate.

So the President evidently today, as reported by Politico, called Mr. BOEHNER to repeat: I'm not going to negotiate on bills to reopen the government or to raise the debt ceiling. That's what's being reported.

Mr. Speaker, this is, I think, a bad precedent. Where I'm from in Dallas, Texas, leaders lead. Leaders lead by trying to do what's in the best interest of everybody, not running to crisis after crisis after crisis, not negotiating, not agreeing to meet with people, not agreeing to do things to help resolution. Leaders present ideas, opportunities, options. They're the ones that stay at the table, and they're the last ones to leave when everybody else gets frustrated.

I think what's important to note is this President is simply different than every other President we've ever had. What he is doing is giving up not only his legitimate moral authority to lead, but what he's doing is saying, I recognize what could happen if we're unsuccessful. I think, as Speaker BOEHNER said yesterday, the President's senior adviser said he would sooner see the government go into default than to meet with and negotiate with the Republicans. That is not what leaders should be doing, and I would suggest to you that this President stands on the shoulders of other Presidents for 230-plus years who have given their very best to the benefit of others. They have looked at Republicans, they have looked at Democrats, they've looked at House Members, they've looked at Senate Members, and realized they had to negotiate. That was one of the key things I remember as a young man about Ronald Reagan's negotiating with Tip O'Neill, inviting Tip O'Neill down to the White House, their being good with each other, talking about how they could make progress with each other.

We are evidently past that. This President even has the audacity to call the Speaker and say, I'm not going to negotiate with you. That is not good leadership, and the American people are seeing it.

The House of Representatives, we're not going to get our nose out of joint. We're going to stay at work. It is true that we bring this bill up, and we'll probably be here tomorrow and the next day with new ways to negotiate. Today, we're here on the floor just as we were yesterday, just as we were on Saturday, talking about constructive, creative, bipartisan issues to fund this government and to make sure we can get moving.

The NIH should have been open already. We should have had lots of government agencies as a result of what we are doing, including Head Start. We should have these activities, even if it's

one by one, to open up. Today, we're on the floor to say, We ought to pay those government employees who have been working when Tuesday rolls around. They should get paid. We should have people at the FAA come back to work and open that agency back up. That's what House Republicans are doing. We recognize this President will not negotiate, but we're going to offer ourselves up. I think the American people see what House Republicans are attempting to do.

I am very proud of not only what our Speaker is doing but of our majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, and our whip, KEVIN MCCARTHY. They are attempting to move forward ideas that sustain this body to where we can look people straight in the eye and where we can accomplish things on behalf of the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are in this predicament because the Republicans shut the government down. It is that simple.

You own this shutdown whether you like it or not.

The gentleman quoted Politico. Let me read from Politico. It says:

President Barack Obama opened the door to a short-term debt ceiling increase in order to avoid going over the fiscal cliff and allowed negotiations between the White House and Congress on a long-term deal.

That doesn't sound like someone who doesn't want to negotiate. I'd prefer a long-term deal because I'm tired of this crisis by crisis by crisis, but this President has gone out of his way to negotiate over and over and over again.

I will just point out another thing for my colleagues. Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and Speaker BOEHNER negotiated a deal on this short-term continuing resolution to keep the government going. Speaker BOEHNER admitted that this week with George Stephanopoulos on Sunday, that they negotiated a short-term spending deal to keep the government open at the Republican sequester levels. The deal was that, in return for the Republican numbers, the Speaker wouldn't attach any extraneous materials to that short-term continuing resolution.

Obviously, that is a deal that the Speaker did not keep in large part because of a group in his conference who kind of represents, I guess, the TED CRUZ wing of the party who said that wasn't enough. They wanted to shut the government down, and they're willing to default on paying our bills for the first time in history. That is, in my opinion, unconscionable.

Let's not talk about who wants to negotiate here. Democrats have negotiated going to your level on the short-term continuing resolution. The President has been willing to negotiate time and time again. Every time he gets close to an agreement, the Speaker can't deliver. He's going to continue to try, but don't say he's not trying to negotiate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to address all remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is really getting more and more difficult for us to get out here and act as though we're really having a serious debate about something, and I just want to start off by saying that I don't want anybody in the country to forget—as they're trying to do things with a Federal Government that's shut down as the VA service centers did, and their phones are now inoperative as we've all learned to our great dismay—the deceased soldiers and their families have not been able to be compensated in any way to make it possible for them to pay for funerals or even go to them. I'm sure that will be something we're going to come up and deal with as they're doing with this part-time “let's build ourselves a new government.”

Don't forget that this was about health care. That's all there is to it. Service people can't get the benefits that they need. Nobody can get anything from the government. Mortgages are on hold because Republicans didn't like health care.

If you would have asked them why in the world do you object to 30 million Americans who have not been able to afford health insurance having an opportunity to get it, they don't give you any answer. It's more obfuscation. If we talk about negotiations, let me tell you the negotiation that is really critical that is not taking place at all, and we're doing an example of that right now.

There is no negotiation in the committee process. The only committee that has been putting anything up to the floor of the House has been the Rules Committee. Somebody writes a bill in the afternoon, and either that evening or early the next day, the Rules Committee goes in, and it goes right to the floor. There is no amendment chance, there's no discussion chance, and we don't know what they're doing. The discussion and the amendments and the negotiation, yes, that's supposed to go on between the two parties in the committees, and it is nowhere to be seen and hasn't been for ages.

We've been down this road before, again with the supercommittee idea, which was such a glaring disaster and only ended up in sequestration, and the whole idea of sequestration was so, with all of that, none of us ever thought we'd get there, but now we're pretending that's what it is. Now it's, Let's have another supercommittee. I will tell you that was so awful, and it set us back so much in this country not only with scientific research and na-

tional security and public safety being compromised, but now they want to do it again.

I think it's just another delaying tactic because I'm persuaded today, as I stand here, that the Republican Party in this House does not want to open the government. The opportunities they've had over and over again have been absolutely quashed. There's a lot of talk in the media about, Oh, if only I had a chance to vote for a clean resolution, I would do it in just a moment. Well, let me tell you that it has been turned down twice before in the House of Representatives on the rule when we got to the part about the previous question. We always say just vote “no” and you will then have your opportunity to vote on the clean bill from the Senate, which already passed there, and would go directly to the President. We never got a single Republican vote. Draw your own conclusions about the 25 Republicans who stated if only they were given that opportunity.

□ 1545

Now the sequestration, as my colleague has pointed out, we accepted as part of a deal on our behalf between Speaker BOEHNER and Senator REID. As awful as it is—and most of us did not like that—nonetheless, for the short-term CR, we were willing to take it, but now the majority, again, refuses to let us vote on a CR which was agreed on.

This irresponsible governance has continued in the days since the majority shut the government down; and over this last week—or last several weeks, actually—the majority has abandoned any semblance of regular order and just turned the Rules Committee, as I've said, into the committee of jurisdiction.

Now, where does all this come from? I think most Americans were surprised. Let me express my concern.

I recall that, just after Senator Obama was elected President in 2008, we all heard about the great dinner that took place on inaugural night, declaring, among Republican elected officials, that they would not allow Senator Obama—now President Obama—to get anything done. Well, we thought after 4 years, maybe that was over with, and we did get the health care bill passed.

Now we learned on Sunday morning that that is taking place again, which again says, you know, I'm not sure that this party could put the government back into business or not because they would have to get the permission, apparently, from the Heritage Foundation's Heritage Action for America, former Attorney General Edwin Meese, and David Koch, because they wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and they engineered this whole thing. That appeared on Sunday. This is Tuesday. Not a single refutation has taken place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. So it's time for this game to come to an end, but it won't because it's not part of the plan. I am really tired, on behalf of the American people, of watching them being fooled; and I think that we are more than disgusted and tired with the process by which this legislation comes to us. The four of us on the Rules Committee are calling for you to open up this process so that the other members of our party—as well as yours who, I am confident, know nothing more about these bills than we do—have an opportunity to really do our jobs as we were sent here to do.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the committee. Just before we came down to the floor, we had a very, very nice committee meeting where she was able to not only articulate that, but was joined by her other colleagues. I did offer words of assurance to them about not only how we need to move forward but also how the committee needed to get slightly better in our time frames, and we're going to attempt to do that.

The gentlewoman recognizes that what we are doing is bringing bills as quickly as we can, including the FAA, opening up the FAA again, and how important that is. So she recognized the importance of what we are attempting to do.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. President, can we talk? The government is partially shut down. The Nation's debt ceiling is looming.

President Obama and HARRY REID have drawn a hard line. They have proclaimed over and over again, no negotiation. They insist the debt limit must be raised at current levels of spending. No negotiation. They're adamant that the status quo must be preserved. And why not?

Here is the status quo: 7.3 percent unemployment 4 years after the recession has ended; 15 percent unemployment for those under 25; 50 percent of recent college graduates unemployed or underemployed; household income down 10 percent in the last 5 years. It has fallen every year since the President has been in office, and it continues to decline. Continued economic stagnation 4 years after the recession has ended; continued record deficit spending; Social Security and Medicare on a path to insolvency.

Why would the Republicans want to discuss these fundamental problems? Why would we want to alter that course?

By any measure, the President's policies are failing miserably:

He is failing our seniors. Their safety nets, Social Security and Medicare, are headed for bankruptcy, but he won't negotiate.

He is failing our middle class through higher taxes, higher energy costs, higher insurance bills on one hand, and on the other hand, a continued decline in household income. They're getting squeezed from both sides, but he won't negotiate.

He is failing our youth, the millennial generation, by piling mountains of debt on our children and our grandchildren, but he won't negotiate. He is failing our youth and millennial generation through his job-killing policies of more regulation, more taxes, and more government.

Mr. President, our youth wants to work, and they're counting on us, but the President won't negotiate. Remember, my friends, that the Democrats held the House, the Senate, and the Presidency for only 2 years; but out of that came ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank, the two biggest expansions of government and killers of jobs to come out of Washington in 50 years.

I didn't want the government to shut down—nobody did—but we cannot continue to run head-on into failure. If we are to change course, the Republicans can't do it on their own. The President and HARRY REID in the Senate will have to participate.

Mr. REID, we are asking once again for a conference.

Mr. President, it's way past time to soften your hard-line stance on no negotiation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to direct all remarks to the Chair and not to another in the second person.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman from South Carolina, who just spoke, I don't know what he is talking about.

We have been negotiating. This temporary spending measure that we're talking about, HARRY REID negotiated it with Speaker BOEHNER. It's at your levels, your sequester levels. Do you think I like that? I can't stand it, but I don't want to shut the government down.

The bottom line was the Speaker said that, in exchange for that, there would be no extraneous materials attached to that CR. He wasn't able to deliver on his promise because of some people in your conference. It's that simple.

The gentleman is on the Budget Committee. I would think that, in being on the Budget Committee, you would want to go to conference—you worked on a budget; the Senate worked on a budget—to work out those spending differences. We have tried 19 times to get you to go to conference, and you refused to negotiate with the Senate on each of those occasions.

Every time the President negotiates, unfortunately, your leadership can't deliver on the deals. So we have been negotiating, negotiating, negotiating. We still want to negotiate, but, please, the gentleman gave no reason why we should shut down this government,

why the Republicans should have shut down this government, and he has given no reason why we should default on our financial obligations. We ought to pass a short-term spending bill to reopen the government, and we ought to pass a clean debt ceiling bill so we don't default on our financial obligations and ruin our economy.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members of an essential rule of decorum in the House. Under clause 1 of rule XVII, Members are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person. Directing remarks through the Chair helps to reduce personal confrontation between Members and fosters an atmosphere of mutual and institutional respect.

The Chair appreciates the attention of the Members to this matter.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I associate myself with his remarks. I thank him for his extraordinary leadership in trying to keep the government open.

Mr. Speaker, this is—what?—the eighth day of the Republican shutdown of government. Small businesses cannot get loans to expand; veterans face uncertainty about their benefits; tuition assistance and the rest. Millions of women and children will go without the nutrition programs that they desperately need.

The shutdown could be over in hours if Republicans would stop being the party of “no” and just take “yes” for an answer.

So in case you don't know, I have some very good news for you: Democrats have not only been willing to negotiate; Democrats have already stated that they are ready to cooperate.

For example, I have good news. Perhaps you missed the fact that 200 Democratic Members of the House have signed a letter saying that they're willing to accept the Republican number of \$986 billion even though, as the gentleman said, we don't like this number—we don't think it's adequate—but the fact is we don't like shutting down the government more.

So, in order to open up government, 200 Members have signed the letter, and five additional Members have made public statements of their willingness to support the Republican number. There's space in this letter for the signatures of maybe just 17 Republicans to sign, but they don't have to sign a letter. Many of them have made public statements, which we respect and honor as their public statements, that they would vote for the Republican number of \$986 billion.

The Speaker negotiated with Senator REID. Senator REID accepted the Republican House number. The President of the United States accepted the Republican House number. The Demo-

crats in the House accepted the Republican House number. The only people not accepting the Republican House number are the Republicans in the House.

So, when the leadership of the Republican Party—Speaker BOEHNER, in particular—go around saying it can't pass, that the votes are not there, does that mean he does not trust the word of his own Members who have said that they will vote for the \$986 billion? Let's find out. Let's bring the bill to the floor.

That is what we are saying: just bring it to the floor. It has passed the Senate. The President stands ready to sign a number we don't like, but prefer it over shutting down government. We don't like it. We want to open the doors of government, and we are willing to use the key of the Republican number to do so.

Last week, Democrats went a step further. In both public and private discussions, Speaker BOEHNER said that he doesn't want to go to conference on the budget even though he asked for regular order in March. In early March, Senator MCCONNELL and Speaker BOEHNER said they wanted regular order. That's a message to the President that Congress should work its will. That was good news to us. That means: you pass a bill in the House; you pass a bill in the Senate; you go to conference to reconcile your differences. Perhaps the Speaker didn't think that the Senate would pass a budget, but they did in a matter of days—practically hours—after the House passed its budget.

But what happened to regular order? It blew out the window. After saying, We want regular order, no longer did the Republicans want to take “yes” for an answer. And why? Well, some of this is explained under the Speaker's own statement. Speaker BOEHNER said, Under rules—listen to that word “rules.” Under rules, if you appoint conferees and after 20 legislative days there is no agreement, the minority has the right to offer motions to instruct, which become politically motivated bombs to throw up on the House floor.

So to be frank with you, we are following what I would describe as regular order. What I would describe as regular order is not “under rules.” “Under rules” are the rules of the House.

The Speaker—as awesome as the power of the Speaker is, and I understand that—does not have the power to just decide what regular order is, and if you don't want to honor regular order, just say you're not going to honor it, but don't redefine it in order to keep government shut down.

So, in listening to the Speaker's not wanting to shut government down at first and then after it was shut down wanting to open it, the House Democrats took a step unprecedented by any minority party in the Congress of the United States. The House Democratic minority said, We will surrender. We will relinquish our right to motions to instruct—an insider term, actually—

placing conditions on how it would go to the conference table.

□ 1600

So we said to the Speaker, don't worry about that. If that's important to you, if you want to shut down government because you're afraid of a motion to instruct, we'll allay your fears. Fear no more, Mr. Speaker. We will not offer these motions.

As an example, we didn't offer the motion on the first night, which was our right to do, when this bill was introduced as all of you will agree.

So we have said, we have made that claim. This, as I said, is unprecedented, but is a necessary move to end the Tea Party stranglehold on our government and restore basic services on which millions of people rely.

They didn't take "yes" for an answer. Two hundred signatures.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit this letter for the RECORD—200 signatures. It's a beautiful sight, because I want to tell you something: it's about cooperation.

None of us likes this number. All of us want to open up government. That's why we signed it. I want to thank Congressman TIM BISHOP, Congressman PATRICK and Congressman KEITH ELLISON for producing this result.

So we've said, yes, we're giving you the votes on something we don't like. We've said we won't do motions to instruct. Please take "yes" for an answer.

If you insist on being the party of "no," then don't hide behind something and say who won't negotiate. We cooperated. We gave you what you wanted.

Now here we are today. Republicans are offering yet another motion to keep the government shut down. Some people call it, in the press, the "super-committee." Others call it the "Ted Cruz committee." Whatever you call it, I'd like to know who writes this stuff. This is so ridiculous a proposal. It's so ridiculous a proposal.

How about we go to the budget table and see how we can reduce the deficit? produce growth for our country?

But all we're going to do is cut our investments in education, investments in making the future better. We're going to make seniors suffer more while we do not touch revenue, and we will not allow any discussion of closing special interest loopholes. That's how they want us to go to the table.

You must be kidding.

As I said, who writes this stuff?

Sometimes there is an expression that people use. Flippantly, they'll say, "Who do you think you are?" when you say something. Remember that from your childhood when somebody said, "Who do you think you are?"

I think we have to take that sentence very seriously, with an emphasis on "think." That would be interesting.

Who do we think we are?

Do we think that we are a party that is responsible, all of us—a Congress that is responsible—that wants to do

the right thing for the American people, that knows that we have to come here to cooperate with each other to get something done in a bipartisan way?

To my fellow colleagues on the Republican side—I hope that's allowed, Mr. Speaker. They are Members of the body—do you think you have come here to make sure that people know that you can do this just because you're doing it?

It's just a waste, a total waste of time, and we don't have time to waste. In fact, we could be spending our time in such a more important way—working in a bipartisan way on entrepreneurship, on creating growth for our country, on investing in the education of our people, which, by the way, brings more money to the Treasury than any other initiative you can name.

Early childhood, K-12, higher education, lifetime learning. You want to reduce the deficit?

Invest in education.

You want to increase the deficit?

Cut education.

But let's sit down and talk about that. The path to get there is one that says, say yes to 986. We did, your number. It says accept our offer. We won't offer any instruction to the committee, but don't continue to be the Tea Party of "no."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Speaker—is that allowed, Mr. Speaker? I hope the Speaker will give us a vote so we can see where this Congress stands on the serious responsibility that we have and that the Republicans will even accept what they are asking us to accept.

This rule should be voted down. This commission is a joke whether you call it the Ted Cruz commission or the super—super in what way? Certainly not super in meeting the needs of the American people.

To recap, A, we are giving you 200 votes for your number. Take "yes" for an answer.

B, the Speaker doesn't want any conditions or discussion or anything else on the floor about the budget. We are willing to accept that.

Take "yes" for an answer.

I ask for a "no" vote on the rule.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Enough is enough.

Today marks the fifth day that the federal government has been shutdown. Please consider how deeply unfair this is to the citizens we represent.

The solution to this crisis is a simple piece of legislation that funds the government at levels that have already passed both chambers of Congress.

At this point, to attach defunding or delaying the Affordable Care Act to legislation needed to reopen the government is to put our economy at risk in order to advance a political agenda.

We demand a vote on a clean continuing resolution immediately so that government functioning can resume and Americans can move on with their lives.

The games have to stop.

Best Regards,

Tim Bishop; Patrick E. Murphy; Nancy Pelosi, Democratic Leader; Steny H. Hoyer, Democratic Whip; James E. Clyburn, Assistant Democratic Leader, Xavier Becerra, Chair, Democratic Caucus; Joseph Crowley, Vice Chair, Democratic Caucus; Nita M. Lowey, Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations; Chris Van Hollen, Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget; Robert E. Andrews; Karen Bass; Joyce Beatty; Ami Bera, Jr.; Sanford Bishop, Jr.; Earl Blumenauer; Suzanne Bonamici; Madeleine Z. Bordallo; Robert A. Brady; Bruce L. Braley; Corrine Brown; Julia Brownley; Cheri Bustos; G.K. Butterfield; Lois Capps; Tony Cardenas; André Carson.

Joaquin Castro; Judy N. Chu; David N. Cicilline; Yvette D. Clarke; Wm. Lacy Clay; Emanuel Cleaver; Steve Cohen; Gerald E. Connolly; John Conyers, Jr.; Jim Costa; Joe Courtney; Henry Cuellar; Elijah E. Cummings; Susan A. Davis; Danny K. Davis; Peter A. DeFazio; Diana DeGette; John K. Delaney; Susan DelBene; Theodore E. Deutch; John Dingell; Lloyd Doggett; Keith Ellison; Eliot L. Engel.

William Enyart; Ana Eshoo; Elizabeth Esty; Sam Farr; Chaka Fattah; Bill Foster; Lois Frankel; Marcia L. Fudge; Tulsi Gabbard; Pete Gallego; John Garamendi; Joe Garcia; Alan Grayson; Gene Green; Al Green; Raúl Grijalva; Luis Gutiérrez; Janice Hahn; Colleen Hanabusa; Alcee Hastings; Denny Heck; Brian Higgins; James A. Himes; Rubén Hinojosa; Rush Holt; Mike Honda; Steve Horsford.

Jared Huffman; Steve Israel; Sheila Jackson Lee; Hakeem Jeffries; Henry C. "Hank" Johnson; Marcy Kaptur; Bill Keating; Robin Kelly; Joseph P. Kennedy, III; Dan Kildee; Derek Kilmer; Ann Kirkpatrick; Ann McLane Kuster; James Langevin; Rick Larsen; John Larson; Barbara Lee; Sander M. Levin; John Lewis; Daniel Lipinski; David Loebsack; Alan S. Lowenthal; Michelle Lujan Grisham; Stephen Lynch; Daniel Maffei; Carolyn B. Maloney; Sean Patrick Maloney.

Doris O. Matsui; Carolyn McCarthy; Betty McCollum; Jim McDermott; James P. McGovern; Jerry McNerney; Gregory Meeks; Grace Meng; Michael H. Michaud; George Miller; Gwen Moore; James P. Moran; Jerrold Nadler; Grace Napolitano; Richard Neal; Gloria Negrete McLeod; Richard Nolan; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Beto O'Rourke; William L. Owens; Frank Pallone; Bill Pascrell; Ed Pastor; Donald Payne; Ed Perlmutter; Gary Peters; Pedro R. Pierluisi.

Mark Pocan; Jared Polis; David Price; Mike Quigley; Nick J. Rahall; Charles Rangel; Cedric Richmond; C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger; Bobby L. Rush; Tim Ryan; Linda T. Sánchez; John P. Sarbanes; Janice Schakowsky; Adam Schiff; Brad Schneider; Allyson Y. Schwartz; Robert C. Scott; José Serrano; Terri Sewell; Carol Shea-Porter; Brad Sherman; Albio Sires; Louise Slaughter; Adam Smith; Jackie Speier; Eric Swalwell; Mark Takano.

Dina Titus; Paul Tonko; Niki Tsongas; Juan Vargas; Marc Veasey; Filemon Vela; Tim Walz; Debbie Wasserman Schultz; Maxine Waters; Mel Watt;

Henry Waxman; Peter Welch; Frederica Wilson; John Yarmuth; Pete Visclosky; Matthew Cartwright; David Scott; Zoe Lofgren; Nydia M. Velázquez; John Carney; Ben Ray Lujan; Michael F. Doyle; Donna F. Edwards; Eddie Bernice Johnson.

Scott H. Peters; Chellie Pingree; Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan; Kurt Schrader; Rosa L. DeLauro; Bennie G. Thompson; Mike Thompson; John Tierney; Kyrsten Sinema; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Kathy Castor; Tammy Duckworth; Collin C. Peterson; Donna M. Christensen; Ron Barber; Michael E. Capuano; Raul Ruiz; Loretta Sanchez.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the minority leader for her comments today and thank her for coming to the floor.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado Springs, Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman for his work on the Rules Committee and for bringing H.J. Res. 89, the Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act, and I rise in support of this act.

Mr. Speaker, this will ensure that Federal employees who have been deemed essential will have no disruption in their pay. That's an excellent step in the right direction, and I wholeheartedly support that concept.

Just on Saturday, the House unanimously—every single Republican and every single Democrat—supported H.R. 3223, and that said that everyone who is a Federal employee will get paid eventually, at the end of this slowdown that we're in right now. So this is a step in the right direction.

But I want to urge that we take up a bill that I introduced yesterday, H.R. 3271, which goes a step further and says there is no distinction between the essential and non-essential Federal worker. All Federal workers are to be brought back immediately and given back pay and put on a regular pay schedule.

We are going to be reimbursing these people for back pay sooner or later anyway. That's what the bill Saturday accomplished that we all supported here in the House, but this would reassure everyone that they can go to work immediately.

There are people who are going to be having a tough time making house and car payments, and these are people with important jobs.

In my district, in Colorado Springs, there are a lot of defense civil workers, and they are supporting the warfighters. The Pentagon is supposed to be bringing all of them back, and many of them are coming back, but not every single one. So I want them to have the assurance that they will get paid immediately on being reinstated and that they will come back to work immediately.

So I think that it would be in the interest of our Federal workforce to take up the bill that I've introduced, H.R. 3271, and bring all civilian furloughed and Federal workers back immediately, with back pay.

But this is a great bill. I do support it, H.J. Res. 89. I thank the Rules Committee for bringing it out.

There has been, unfortunately, some gamesmanship we've seen with the National Park Service. I think that that's unfortunate. Shutting down the World War II Memorial when veterans are in their eighties and nineties, coming to Washington, maybe for the last visit that they can, and they're being told they can't enter the memorial.

So let's don't have any gamesmanship. Let's bring everyone back to work.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to end the games, I have a better idea. Just open up the government. End the Republican shutdown.

It's really simple. We could have an up-or-down vote to open up government today, and all the Federal workers would be taken care of, and all the monuments would be reopened. We wouldn't be having all this controversy. We can get serious about negotiating a long-term spending bill. It's a better way.

So join with us and support a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the Dean of the House.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my dear friend from Massachusetts.

As I begin, I express my great affection and respect for my colleague from Texas, who is my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are here to be ashamed of ourselves. We're wasting the taxpayers' time, the taxpayers' money, and we're wasting the business and the time of the House.

We are taking up a bill to require that Members of Congress sit down and talk about deficit reduction and raising the debt limit. The last time I checked, we didn't need a law to do that. It's already our job. We have a conference that we can call at any time between the House and the Senate, which would enable us then to get to the serious business in handling this matter under the regular order. We don't do it. I don't know why.

The President says he is not going to negotiate with a gun at his head. Frankly, I wouldn't either, and I don't think anybody else in this place would. Beyond that, he also is not going to negotiate the full faith and credit of the United States, which is one of the questions at issue.

So one of the problems we seem to have with our Republican friends is that their Tea Party fringe is so ideologically hell-bent in getting their way that they're finding that they're too extreme to get it.

Now, we Democrats have shown a willingness to cooperate and to compromise. In fact, as the minority leader

observed, we have asked Speaker BOEHNER to convene a budget conference all year, but to no avail.

Two hundred Democrats, including myself, sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER on Saturday, saying we'd support an extension of sequester-level spending through November 15. Democrats don't want the sequester to begin with, but the interest of compromise and keeping government open says that we're going to show good faith to my Republican colleagues.

And what is my Republican colleagues' response?

No. Resurrect the failed supercommittee. They have apparently read the Peter Principle, which says, when you can't think of anything else to do, appoint a committee, and they will obfuscate the matter further.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to put an end to these asinine antics and maneuverings. It's time to pass the Senate continuing resolution. It's time to show the Americans and the rest of the world that a great institution, created by an enormously wise group of men who made the United States Constitution, is an institution that is not beyond hope of redemption and that it can work together.

We offered to work together with my Republican friends and colleagues. We hope that they will do this.

I would simply observe that we are engaged here in another curious practice also. We're going to have it so that we're going to pay Federal workers for doing nothing. Imagine that.

My Republican colleagues, over the years, during my career here, have always been complaining about "welfare queens" who would ride to the welfare office to get their pension checks. Well, here we are going to convert a bunch of Federal employees to "welfare queens" by paying them while they do not work. The whole thing is silly, and the American people feel so.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Dean of the House has spoken. I gather, from his comments, that he would not like to be appointed on the committee, and I'm disappointed. I was rather hopeful that the minority leader would see that he would be exactly the kind of commonsense person that could represent the party, and so I'd hope that the gentleman would reconsider that.

At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

We've heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle they only need us to take up one bill. Well, what about all those bills we've sent over to the Senate, including four appropriations bills that the Senate won't take up to vote on?

It seems to me that they ought to be doing that if they want to show some good faith effort.



Today, as we have every day since October 1, the House of Representatives is taking yet another bipartisan step forward to resolve our differences with the United States Senate and reopen the Federal Government for the American people.

Even prior to October 1, House Republicans took numerous reasonable steps toward compromise. We voted four times on separate proposals to fund the entire government. With each vote, we sought to lay the groundwork for bipartisan compromise.

Our final two full-funding proposals simply addressed the fundamental unfairness in ObamaCare, the fact that American families won't get the same year to prepare for ObamaCare that the President decided to give to businesses and the fact that Members of Congress will get a subsidy to pay ObamaCare premiums that the rest of America will not.

Every vote from the House of Representatives has had at least some Democrat support. Not one Senate vote has been bipartisan.

While we've moved to the middle, Senate Democrats still refuse to budge. They won't even send any Senators to sit down and talk with House Republicans about a bipartisan solution to reopen government.

□ 1615

One noteworthy area, though, where there seems to be great opportunity for us to move forward with our Democrat colleagues is on the matter of Federal employee pay. One of this rule's underlying bills will ensure timely pay for Federal employees who have continued to work through this shutdown. Those who are defending our borders, our food supply, and our Capitol, should be paid on time. It's my hope that both sides will come together and support this rule and the underlying Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act.

Mr. Speaker, we don't expect to agree on everything with our Democrat colleagues. The House appointed a team on September 30 to meet with the Senate and find common ground to fund the government. When our team gathered on the morning of October 1, no one from the Senate showed up. Every day since, the Senate has refused to be part of any discussions with the House on how to move forward. That refusal is inexcusable.

That's why the House will be considering another bill today, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act, to bring Senate Democrats to the table. Once the Senators have come to the table, we can start building on areas where we should have common ground and reach a solution that benefits all of the American people. But it starts with a talk.

Both the rule and the underlying bills have my support, and I urge the same from my colleagues.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just remind my colleagues there's an easy way to solve all of this—reopen the government, raise the debt ceiling, and negotiate a new budget. Our minority leader has already said it on the floor. It's our willingness to cooperate.

It's not that complicated. You can save all this misery that Federal workers are now enduring by reopening the government right now. This is not that hard to do, and it's at your number. It's at Republican levels. That is a compromise on our part. We loathe those sequester numbers that Republicans insisted on enshrining—those are horrible for our economy—but to keep the government open, we're going to swallow that so we have time to work out a longer-term deal.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his time.

I am glad that the minority leader got on the floor of the House and spoke common sense and indicated two things. Right now, there are 200 Members who would be willing to vote for a clean CR that would open this House, right now. We believe a number of Republicans would make it a bipartisan vote, and we'd be able to open the government.

The Republicans are playing a game of Legos. They are taking that big red box and opening it up and throwing the Legos on the ground and are trying to construct a government. Well, that's a kids' game—and it's a good game—but we cannot play with the lives of the American people.

Just a few minutes ago, we talked about restoring Head Start. We know that that bill is going nowhere. We know that the sequester is continuing to undermine Head Start seats across America—57,000 of them. In fact, it's an empty chair across America, where little babies cannot go to a Head Start program. That's what the Republicans are trying to do. They're trying to tell Marlen Rosa that her 3-year-old son, Hector, couldn't go to Head Start.

And what is their answer? Another supercommittee—a committee that maybe will be playing Legos itself because the last supercommittee—of course, we respect all of our Members—was not the solution to our problem.

I tell you what the solution is, Mr. Speaker. It is to vote on the clean bill, open the government, let the FAA be in operation, let the Justice Department be in operation.

In the meeting that I just came from, I learned 90 courts are vacant. Issues dealing with rape and domestic violence are not being attended to. Public defenders are not being resourced and are being laid off. Hundreds of lawyers are not in the Department of Justice. The American Bar Association says there is no justice.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is not get a supercommittee, but get a supercommitment to America.

Vote for a clean bill, and vote for the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, I again rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation.

I oppose this rule because it is not a serious effort to end the government shutdown engineered by House Republicans by cherry-picking some programs and now adding a smoke and mirrors effort to replace the negotiation of the Budget bills passed by both the House and the Senate.

Both President Obama and Senate Majority Leader REID have made it crystal clear that they will not accept this game-playing and now the American people are saying the same thing.

A piecemeal strategy now being pursued by House Republicans is not an honest or serious option to reopen the government and will not end the impacts of this shutdown that extend across our country.

A consequence of partial funding of the entire Federal government one piece at a time instead of through a clean CR is the denial of burial assistance to the families of four troops who were killed by an IED in southern Afghanistan.

The majority leadership of the House has America facing a government at war and a government shutdown at the same time.

The majority of the House has found a way to intentional inflicted wounds on the American public—not by accident, but as a political strategy to get what they cannot do through the regular legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, today the Washington Post Editorial Board said it best:

What have House Republicans managed to accomplish in a week of government shutdown? Damage the livelihood of millions of Americans? Check. Government secretaries, food-truck operators, cleaners who work in motels near national parks: They're all hurting. Waste billions of taxpayer dollars? Check. It costs a lot to shut agencies, Web sites and parks, and it will cost a lot to reopen them. Meanwhile, the House has voted to pay the salaries, eventually, of hundred of thousands of employees whom it has ordered not to work. That's an odd way to manage an enterprise. Interfere with key government operations? Check. Rattle the markets, slow an economy in recovery, interrupt potentially lifesaving research at the National Institutes of Health? Check, check and check. Derail the hated Obamacare? Ch—Oh, no, wait a minute. That was the GOP's ostensible purpose for this travesty of misgovernment, but the online insurance markets created by that law opened on schedule last week and continue to operate.

The House Republicans' continued refusal to take up and vote on the clean CR passed by the Senate over a week ago, and which the President has stated publicly on several occasions he would sign is ignoring the easy solution to this impasse.

Now faced with strong public backlash—more than 70% of Americans disapproving of the government shutdown engineered by the House Republicans, the majority is trying to extricate themselves from this debacle by bringing to the floor and passing "mini-CRs."

The House majority should know that the American public knows and very well understands what is happening. This is legislative theater at its worst—noise and thunder signifying nothing.

Mr. Speaker, these ploys are a cynical waste of time giving false hope to innocent Americans who depend on the services provided by these programs. But House Republicans know they have no chance whatsoever

of becoming law. The Senate will not pass them and the President would veto these piece-meal measures if they made it to his desk.

All we are doing is wasting time when we should be helping people.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can keep our promises to our veterans, to our elderly, to our children, parents and young people as well as the 800,000 Federal workers that our government is needed, compassionate, strong and effective.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund our engineers and technicians who maintain all of our critical military equipment to keep our troops safe and take care of national security infrastructure.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund the services needed by those who rely upon our full faith and credit as well as our word that this nation will not forget its fallen heroes.

For these reasons and more, I oppose this rule and urge my Republican colleagues to rescue the American people from this situation and end the disruption in the lives of 800,000 dedicated workers who take pride in the greatest jobs in the world: serving the American people.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, we heard from one of the brightest voices of the Republican Party, a member of our Republican leadership, VIRGINIA FOXX.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), a member of the Budget Committee and the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say I saw my chairman get on his feet when the gentleman from Michigan began to speak. It's not often that the dean of the House comes down to speak. It's a treat for me, too. I've been here 2½ years, but I've been watching the process a lot longer than that. I do think there's a lot that we can learn from history and a lot that we can learn, as Chris Matthews put it on his show the other day, from when politics worked.

There is no shortage of shrill voices in Washington, D.C., and when I get back home to the folks in the suburbs of metro Atlanta, rarely do I hear somebody say, ROB, I wish there were more angry people in Washington. I wish there were more folks pounding their fists and yelling and screaming, because I really think that's how solutions can be brought about.

That's not how solutions are brought about anywhere. It's not how they're brought about in business. It's not how they're brought about in politics. It's not how they're brought about in kindergartens around the country.

I have a chart here, Mr. Speaker, that says that the Democrat Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, who presided over some of the most trying times in our Nation and some of the biggest deals in our Nation, was often in conflict with the President of a different party. While Tip O'Neill was Speaker of the House, the government shut down 12 times.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, not to say that a government shutdown is okay. It's not. I didn't want it to happen. It doesn't need to happen. I'm glad we're bringing more bills to the floor to reopen the government—we are already more than 50 percent of the way there with the bills that have come to the floor. But it is happening, and it's not happening because Republican this and Republican that.

I commented earlier to some of my Democratic friends about what great party discipline they have displayed in never talking about a government shutdown but in always making sure it's a "Republican government shutdown." I suppose you get points for that in terms of party unity, but it's just not true; nor has it ever been true in the history of our Republic that when legitimate policy differences come about, driven by our constituents back home, that the best way forward to solve those is to make sure you demonize the other guy and make sure folks know who to blame for it.

In these 12 times that the Democratic Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, was leading this institution—the people's House—and the government shut down, it wasn't because Tip O'Neill was a bad man. It wasn't because he lost control of some liberal faction within his party. It was because the House of Representatives, the closest voice to the American people in our Republic, had legitimate policy differences with the President of the United States, and that's where we sit today.

What's surprising is not that we have legitimate policy differences with the President of the United States. What's surprising is that we bring a bill to the floor to fund Head Start, and that becomes complicated. What's surprising is that we bring a bill to the floor to make sure that our men and women are getting paid, and that creates the controversy. What's surprising is we bring a bill to the floor to fund nuclear security across the country, and that's what brings controversy.

There is so much that we agree on, and I am certain we're going to find the pathway forward; but I am equally certain that that pathway forward is not going to be found more quickly in depending on how much we can embarrass and marginalize our political opponents. It's going to be found when we agree that there is more that unites us than divides us, and it's okay that we have some serious policy differences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman is actually the one who appointed me as the rules designee to the Budget Committee, and I'm grateful to him for that because it really gives me an opportunity to express what, for my constituents, is commonsense budget re-

form, Mr. Speaker. They know you just can't keep spending and spending and spending and never have to pay the bills. The bills have to get paid.

But I would say that the funding level that the United States Senate has agreed on is absolutely in no way a compromise. It's the law of the land. The law of the land, if this Congress were to dissolve itself tomorrow, is that for fiscal year 2014 we're only going to be able to spend \$967 billion. The Senate wants to spend \$986 billion. The law of the land is not going to let them spend that much. That's just the law of the land.

Now, we don't have to like it. We can try to change that, but to characterize that as somehow moving to the middle is to misrepresent, Mr. Speaker, what the facts of our budget are.

As my colleague from North Carolina said so well, the House has adopted a position, and the Senate rejected it. So we moved to the middle and adopted a position, and the Senate rejected it. So we moved further to the middle, adopted a position, and the Senate rejected it. Then we said, Let's just sit down and talk about it to find that pathway forward.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, are talking a lot about a budget conference. I suspect we'll continue to hear that. I even read about it in the National Journal—apparently, that message is being sold well—but as my friends on both sides of the aisle know, a budget conference has absolutely no force of law whatsoever. Zero. We can conference a budget until we're blue in the face, Mr. Speaker, and we will never change one penny of Federal spending.

Now that's different from the conference that this House moved to go to with the Senate. The conference that this House moved to have with the Senate—where we could actually change the law, where we could fund the government, where we could deal with the debt ceiling, where we could focus on priorities that each one of us has for our families back home—the conference this House moved to create, Mr. Speaker, can change the law.

Let's do something that matters. Let's do it today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I served as an aide here on Capitol Hill when Tip O'Neill was Speaker of the House. I think he is one of the greatest Speakers that ever served in the United States House of Representatives. He was a friend of mine as well.

I will tell you that Speaker O'Neill would never go on national TV and threaten to default on the debt to this Nation. He would never, ever act in a way that might bring this economy to ruin. He put country before political party.

I would also say that Speaker O'Neill understood the importance of working in a bipartisan way. He would be disgusted with the way this House is being

run today. The bottom line is he'd be scratching his head right now, wondering why we just don't resolve this in a very simple way.

There were 200 Democrats who have signed a letter saying, We will cooperate with the Republicans to pass a clean continuing resolution at Republican levels, and we know that there are 20 Republicans in the House who publicly said they would support such a move. That's the majority. We could open up the government in a matter of minutes. In the Senate, over a dozen Republican Senators voted for cloture on a clean continuing resolution. That is bipartisanship. Accept it. This is the way this House should be run.

So I would just point that out to my colleagues that we're going through all this rigamarole for I don't know what when we could end this Republican shutdown right now by bringing a clean continuing resolution at Republican levels to the House floor. It would pass in a bipartisan way, and I predict that there will even be more than 20 Republicans that would support it. They want a way out of this.

Let's open the government. Let us not use the debt ceiling in the threatening manner in which it's being used by the Republican leadership here. We should never—I don't care what your political ideology is—default on our financial obligations. That is economic ruin for this country, and I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that. We should never use that in such a political way.

Let's work together and appoint budget conferees and go to negotiate a budget conference so we can have some parameters in terms of numbers we can work with.

I listened to some of my colleagues talking on the other side—even those who serve on the Budget Committee—and you wonder why we should have a Budget Committee if the Budget Committee doesn't mean anything. I have a lot more respect for the people that serve on that committee.

As this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

□ 1630

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Also, let me just associate myself with the gentleman from Massachusetts' comments with regard to Speaker O'Neill. I, too, was a staffer during that period when the great Speaker, Mr. O'Neill, was Speaker, and there is no way that he would have allowed this hostage-taking to occur.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. Again, I just have to say, we've seen this 8 days, unfortunately, and it is a Tea Party Republican government shutdown. We've seen \$2.4 billion in lost economic activity; and so, yes, this hostage-taking, it continues.

Hostage-taking really is a deplorable tactic. The Tea Party Republicans con-

tinue to want to deny millions of Americans health care—and, yes, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, which the Supreme Court has upheld. That's why the shutdown continues, and the public knows it.

Yet, instead of bringing up a budget bill to open up the government or pass a debt limit increase to pay our bills, the House has taken up two more last-minute bills to distract from their Tea Party Republican shutdown. This most recent bill establishes a supercommittee to make recommendations on spending and changes.

I want to remind my colleagues, this is the same proposal—or very similar—that got us into this devastating sequester in the first place. We've been there; we've done that. Thanks, but no thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Now, as a member of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, I can tell you that both the House and Senate have passed budget resolutions. Democrats have been trying to work out our budget differences for 6 months, but Republicans continue to block these efforts. The American people deserve a functioning government.

The public understands that we can open up the government. And I have to say, the Democrats did not want the funding level of the Senate budget bill, but we are compromising to get this government open.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. It's also important to recognize, again, as an appropriator and as a member of the Budget Committee, I hear and see each and every day, whenever we're in committee, the tactics and the discussion with regard to cuts to Head Start and the women and children nutrition assistance program—all of those programs that just very recently the Republican Tea Party Members have started to say that they support. So let's see what happens. I hope that they do support this when we get to these budget negotiations.

It's time that we shut down this shutdown. We need to reject this rule. Let's have an up-or-down vote to open up this government and let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that there is a lot of dialogue on the floor today about opening up the government. Yet this body has passed bill after bill after bill—whether it's the intelligence community, whether it's Head Start, whether it's NIH—making sure that we are going through a deliberative process. Repeatedly, you are seeing where our friends on the other side vote “no,” and when it gets to the other body, even though it's a passed piece of legislation, the Senate, our friends over there, ignore the bills. I kind of wonder what we're really try-

ing to aim at, whether we're really just trying to score political points or whether we can begin working together. That's what House Republicans are here to do: to set aside our differences, to try and fund these issues, to try and deal with the President.

Earlier in the week, our great young Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, went to the White House. He was asked to come to the White House, and really all he was there to be told by the President was: I won't negotiate. I won't negotiate. I won't negotiate. Then, as Mr. BOEHNER tells the story, he got that message, so he came back to work. Here we are, trying to send ideas out about working together.

The working group intentionally was an open-ended opportunity for Members of Congress—10 on the House side, 10 on the Senate side—to work together with an opportunity, as a working group, to try and overcome this by-pass. That's what we're trying to do. I think we're going to be faithful to it. I think we're going to pass this here today, and then we're going to see what the Senate will do again—I'm sure, once again, just another piece of log over in their fireplace for the Senate majority leader to burn down. I am hopeful here today that we have common sense, and I think we will pass this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would advise the gentleman, at this time, I do not have any further speakers. I thank the gentleman for asking.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on the clean Senate continuing resolution so that we can send it to the President for his signature today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as we bring this debate to a close, I have the dueling emotions of being angry and being very sad—angry that we are putting the American people through this trauma. This is totally unnecessary. This is a manufactured crisis.

When my colleagues talk about the fact that Democrats aren't willing to negotiate, let me just refer to some of

the recent headlines: “Nineteen Times Democrats Tried to Negotiate with Republicans”; that’s according to the *National Journal*. “Republicans Spent Year Blocking Budget Conference”; that was in the *Huffington Post*. “Boehner Tells GOP He is Through Negotiating with Obama”; that was in *The Hill* newspaper. I mean, those are the headlines about my friends’ actions during these recent weeks.

The bottom line is that what we’re doing today really is sad because I think it diminishes this institution. We ought to be solving problems. We ought to be finding ways to lift people up. We ought to be trying to debate ways to create more jobs and opportunity in this country. We ought to get the government running. We ought to deal with the debt ceiling, not politicize it, and we ought to work on a long-term negotiation so we have a long-term spending bill that makes sense for this country, and we’re not doing that.

We’re coming up with a committee today that does nothing. You pass this bill, the government still shuts down. You pass this bill, we’re still headed for a default on our obligations on October 17. This does nothing. It does nothing. It is sad because it is beneath this great House of Representatives. So many incredible things have happened on this floor, and yet this is so trivial. It is so meaningless at a time of such a great crisis.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that this is a crisis that my friends have brought on themselves. There is nothing that says that we should be in shutdown today other than the fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle decided to shut the government down.

Now they’re saying they care about the monuments and they care about our senior citizens and our veterans, but they’re the ones who shut the government down. They say they don’t want to default on our financial obligations, yet we heard on “This Week” with George Stephanopoulos that the Speaker of the House is prepared to basically see this country default on our debt. That’s what he said.

I mean, I am shocked by that kind of talk. I don’t care what party you’re in, where you come from ideologically. We all should at least agree that we ought to pay our bills, that if we don’t, it will do great damage to our economy, and it will hurt your constituents just as much as mine. We could do so much better. We could do so much better than this.

I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who say they want a vote on a clean continuing resolution to vote with us on some of these procedural motions. Start giving us some votes on these procedural motions, because it appears that your leadership will not give you the right to an up-or-down vote. Notwithstanding all of the talk about a transparent process, an open process, you’re not going to get that vote unless you force it.

Here is the other sad thing. My friends on the other side of the aisle began this Congress by talking about regular order and a transparent, open process. Of all the stuff we’ve been voting on these last few days, nobody has seen it. Even the committee chairman who oversees these bills doesn’t even come to the Rules Committee to testify. We don’t know what we’re voting on here.

We can do better. Reject this rule. Vote “no” on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate my dear friend, my colleague, from Worcester, Massachusetts. I will describe it to him real fast.

Mr. Speaker, what we’re trying to do is open up all the employees that are home at the FAA. That’s it. We’re going to bring them back to work; pay them; get it done, all the employees at the FAA.

Secondly, we’re trying to form a working group. We’re trying to work around the process that has gotten bogged up today, with an idea from our Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, and our Majority Leader, ERIC CANTOR, and our whip, KEVIN MCCARTHY, and a couple of people who are in the Republican leadership who are saying let’s find another way around the logjam that we’ve got. So we came up with a good idea and said let’s go to a working group. Let’s actually get 10 Members of the Senate and 10 Members of the House. Let’s meet. Let’s meet very quickly. As a matter of fact, the resolution says that, within 1 day, they’ve got to be selected; within 1 day after that, they have to meet. Let’s put them to work. Let’s put the Members to work on this on a bipartisan, bicameral basis. That is what this is about. It is really pretty simple.

Mr. Speaker, this is not really rocket science right now. We’re engaged in how we put one foot in front of the other, and Republicans have been doing this for 3 weeks. We’re meeting at the Rules Committee. We’re taking testimony. We are listening to the people who come to the committee.

We have very vigorous, detailed debates where Members, Republicans and Democrats, come to the Rules Committee from the Appropriations Committee. As a matter of fact, we’ve seen some star witnesses in this House—stars, good people, great ideas—trying to push that we’re going to work together. We’re going to do this together. We can do this together. Not all the bills were agreed to, but a bunch of them have been on a bipartisan basis.

So you never know when you throw up a good idea whether somebody is going to take you up on it or not. We have had a couple where that has worked; and we, as Republicans, are going to stay after it. We’re the ones willing to negotiate.

Now, there was a discussion about us showing up at the World War II Memo-

rial. Yup, sure did. I did that myself, too. The reason we went down there is that there are men and women who served in the military during World War II who, at the last years of their lives, are coming up in what are called Honor Flights, where they come up here and meet together as people who were comrades in arms for the United States of America, who fought the Axis of Evil, the Germans, the Japanese, and others. They wanted to come just about 2 miles from here down to the World War II Memorial, and it was locked. It was bolted up and locked. So a couple of colleagues, my fellow Texans, went down there last week and found out—the park ranger was there. Well, who’s allowed to get in? First Amendment protesters. First Amendment protesters are the only ones allowed in—well, and Members of Congress. So these two colleagues of mine took bolt cutters, opened it up, and it has been open ever since.

That’s what Republicans are trying to do. We are trying to do that not just for the World War II Memorial; we are trying to do that for this government. We are trying to work on commonsense ideas. We are asking for this House of Representatives to be with us today.

I support this rule. I support the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 373 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, shall be taken from the Speaker’s table and the pending question shall be, without intervention of any point of order, whether the House shall recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of receding from the House amendment and concurring in the Senate amendment without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

Sec. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in section 5 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT  
REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s

ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the

House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the BBC News, on October 1, 2013 in England, published the following: "For most of the world, a government shutdown is very bad news—the result of revolution, invasion or disaster. Even in the middle of its ongoing civil war, the Syrian government has continued to pay its bills and workers' wages. That leaders of one of the most powerful nations on earth willingly provoked a crisis that suspends public services and decreases economic growth is astonishing to many.";

Whereas the state-run Xinhua news service, on October 2, 2013 in China, published the following: "With no political unity to redress its policy mistake, a dysfunctional Washington is now overspending the confidence in its leadership.";

Whereas The News of Mexico, on September 25, 2013 in Mexico, published the following: "They squabble over the inconsequential accomplishment of a 10-week funding extension. It isn't serious, but it certainly isn't funny.";

Whereas the Australian, on October 1, 2013 in Australia, published the following: "The irresponsible way in which Congress . . . played the politics of partisan petulance and obstruction . . . does them little credit. Neither does it say much for the budgetary processes in the world's largest economy.";

Whereas the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, on October 2, 2013 in Germany, published the following: "The main actors in this dispute, which brings together many factors, both ideological and political, took a huge risk and, unhindered, proceeded to validate everyone who ever accused the political establishment in Washington of being rotten to the core . . . The public is left wondering how things could have been allowed to get to this point and why there is so much poison in the system.";

Whereas the Süddeutsche Zeitung, on October 2, 2013 in Germany, published the following: "What has already been apparent in America for a few years now is the self-destruction of one of the world's oldest democracies. And the great tragedy here is that this work of destruction isn't being wrought by enemies of democracy, greedy lobbyists or sinister major party donors. America's democracy is being broken by the very people who are supposed to carry and preserve it . . . the politicians . . . At the moment, Washington is fighting over the budget and nobody knows if the country will still be solvent in three weeks . . . What is clear, though, is that America is already politically bankrupt.";

Whereas the Washington Post, on September 30, 2013, quoted Justice Malala, a political commentator in South Africa as saying the following: "They tell us, 'You guys are not being fiscally responsible' . . . And now we see that they are running their country a little like a banana republic . . . there is a lot of sniggering going on.";

Whereas the headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on October 1, 2013, read: "House of Turds", and the bylines stated: "D.C. cesspools shut down government" and "They get paid while nation suffers";

Whereas these reports call into question the dignity of the House; and

Whereas the resulting reduction in the public's perception of the House's dignity has culminated in a 7% Congressional approval rating in the most recent Economist/YouGov poll: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House—

(1) without seeking to effect a change in the rules or standing orders of the House or their interpretation; and

(2) without prescribing a special order of business for the House—

that a government shutdown is a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a "clean" continuing appropriations resolution to end it.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida wish to present argument on why the resolution is privileged under rule IX to take precedence over other questions?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I do

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the dignity of the House has been called into question. You have heard the text of the resolution, but I think that some points bear highlighting.

The BBC News has reported that "leaders of one of the most powerful nations on Earth"—by the way, that is still us—"willingly provoked a crisis that suspends public services."

A leading Chinese news service stated:

A dysfunctional Washington is now overspending the confidence in its leadership.

A German newspaper stated:

The main actors in this dispute took a huge risk and proceeded to validate everyone who ever accused the political establishment in Washington of being rotten to the core. The public is left wondering how things could have been allowed to get to this point and why there is so much poison in the system.

Another German newspaper said:

What has already been apparent in America for a few years now is the self-destruction of one of the world's oldest democracies. And the great tragedy here is that this work of destruction isn't being wrought by enemies of democracy, greedy lobbyists, or sinister major party donors. America's democracy is being broken by the very people who are supposed to carry and preserve it—the politicians. What is clear, though, is that America is already politically bankrupt.

The headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on the first day of the government shutdown read this way—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair has heard the reading of the resolution.

Does the gentleman have an argument to present as to why it qualifies as a matter of privilege under rule IX?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I do, and I was about to get to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you.

As I just indicated, the headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on the first day of the government shutdown read this way: "House of Turds."

The bylines stated: “D.C. cess-pools shut down government,” and “They get paid while the Nation suffers.”

Just today, a new poll came out that demonstrated as follows:

A national poll asked the following questions:

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or witches? Congress, 32 percent; witches, 46 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or hemorrhoids? Congress, 31 percent; hemorrhoids, 53 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or dog poop? Congress, 40 percent; dog poop, 47 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair would again ask the gentleman from Florida to address whether or not this resolution is privileged under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I am explaining why it is privileged under rule IX.

May I continue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed so long as the gentleman confines his remarks to whether or not the resolution is privileged under rule IX. Should the gentleman fail to continue along that path, pursuant to the Chair's guidance, the gentleman will no longer be recognized, and the Chair will be prepared to rule on the question.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, one of the questions before the House on this resolution is whether the dignity of the House has been offended. I am demonstrating vividly that the dignity of the House has been offended in support of this resolution.

May I continue without interruption?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may continue under the previous guidance issued by the Chair.

Proceed.

Mr. GRAYSON. Good.

The current polling indicates:

What do you have a higher opinion of, Americans: Congress or toenail fungus? Congress, 41 percent; toenail fungus, 44 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or cockroaches? Congress, 42 percent; cockroaches, 44 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or potholes? Congress, 36 percent; potholes, 47 percent.

And finally—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Once again, the Chair requests the gentleman from Florida to confine his remarks to whether or not the matter is privileged under rule IX. Should the gentleman proceed in any other manner, the Chair will be prepared to rule on the question.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, that is exactly what I have been doing. I would ask the Chair to allow me to continue without further interruption.

May I continue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed so long as his comments are confined to the procedural issue of whether or not the issue is privileged under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, I want to repeat: one of the questions to make that determination is whether the dignity of the House has been offended.

As I indicated, there is one final point to make here before I get into further argument, which is this: the American public is now of the following opinion:

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or zombies? Congress, 37 percent; zombies, 43 percent.

Now, clearly, statements such as these and others cited in the resolution call into question the dignity of the House. These statements are not from a single editorial or merely one passerby. These statements are being expressed around the Nation and across the globe.

They have contributed to a Congressional approval rating plummeting to 7 percent—that is 7 percent—in the latest Economist/YouGov poll, and they must be addressed by this body.

Thankfully, rule IX of the rules of the House of Representatives provides Members a mechanism through which to address those times when the dignity of the House has been harmed and called into question. It allows for questions of privilege.

Specifically, rule IX reads as follows:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and integrity of its proceedings.

I submit to you, Mr. Chair, that these are questions squarely within the dignity of the House of Representatives.

Further, rule IX provides that:

A resolution reported as a question of the privileges of the House, shall have precedence of all other questions except motions to adjourn.

I have offered a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House, and I am here today to secure a vote on that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, you should find the obvious, which is that the dignity of the House has been called into question and that no part of the resolution that I have offered goes beyond the scope of a question of privilege—such as attempting to legislate—so that a vote must be allowed on this measure.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, the vote that should be allowed would be on the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House—

(1) without seeking to effect a change in the rules or standing orders of the House or their interpretation; and

(2) without prescribing a special order of business for the House—that a government shutdown is

—and this is obvious at this point—

a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a “clean” continuing appropriations resolution to end it.

That is right—“a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a ‘clean’ continuing appropriations resolution to end it.”

What then is a satisfactory question of privilege?

Well, from the plain text of rule IX, and from existing precedent, a satisfactory resolution must demonstrate that the dignity of the House has been called into question. It has been called into question to such a degree that I wanted to show you the cover from the Daily News, that I was prevented from doing so, because to show it to you—just to show it to you—would somehow be considered to be offensive to the dignity of this House.

And the resolved clause of the resolution may not diverge into affecting the legislative actions of this body.

I argue, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution satisfies both accounts.

I have found no precedent in the annotated House Rules and Manual or Hind's or Cannon's or Deschler's Precedents that would allow the Chair to rule against the resolution before us today. In fact, one would question whether this entire body—including the Parliamentarian—has been politicized unnecessarily if you do rule against that today.

Not once do the precedents address a resolution that outlines a litany of condemnations against Congress from media sources around the world and here at home, as opposed to responding to a single source of criticism. Not once do the precedents rule on a resolution citing Congressional approval ratings below 10 percent in conjunction with persistent reporting against the dignity of the House.

If the first hurdle to be crossed today is that the dignity of the House has to be called into question, then, Mr. Speaker, you are required to rule in favor of this resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

If “dignity” means what the dictionary says it means—“the state or quality of being worthy of honor or respect”—then surely the honor and respect of this House has been called into question.

When only 7 out of 100 Americans approve of what we do—the lowest approval rating ever—then surely our dignity has been diminished and is actively being called into question.

If we are to be called “obstructionists” and practitioners of “partisan petulance,” if we are to be called an establishment that is “rotten to the core,” and if we are leaving Americans wondering why there is “so much poison in the system,” then surely our dignity as a body has been diminished.

If we are accused of “willingly provoking crises that suspend public services and decrease economic growth,” then surely our dignity as a body has been diminished.

If we cause international media outlets to refer to us as “politically bankrupt” and responsible for “breaking America's democracy,” then our dignity as a body, as a House, is being called into question.



□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair has heard enough and is prepared to rule.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, the Chair has not heard my arguments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from Florida that he is not recognized and that the Chair is prepared to rule on the question.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, excuse me, but I have a point of parliamentary order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Hearing argument on a question of order is within the Chair's discretion. The Chair will once again advise the gentleman from Florida that the Chair is ready to rule on the question.

Mr. GRAYSON. I would remind the Chair that the Chair actually agreed to hear my argument. Having done so, the Chair needs to hear my full argument.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the question of whether the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida constitutes a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, I have to say, Mr. Chair, that in doing so, you, yourself, at this point—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized.

The resolution alleges that a lapse in appropriations impairs the dignity of the House. It further expresses a sense of the House concerning action it might take on an appropriation measure. The gentleman from Florida casts this proposal as a statement.

As the Chair ruled on recent occasions such as October 2 and October 3, 2002; March 11, 2008; and December 13, 2011—in each case consistent with a principle enunciated by Speaker Gillett in his landmark ruling of May 6, 1921—a resolution expressing a legislative sentiment ordinarily does not give rise to a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

The precedent of March 11, 2008, is particularly illustrative. On that occasion, a resolution alleged that legislative inaction had brought discredit upon the House, and declared that the House should consider a motion to concur in a specified Senate amendment. The Chair held that the resolution did not present a question affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, its dignity or the integrity of its proceedings as required under rule IX.

These precedents are annotated in sections 702 and 706 of the House Rules and Manual. The principle upon which they stand was articulated by the Chair on January 24, 1996, as follows:

To rule that a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX may be raised by allegations of perceived discredit brought upon the House by legislative action or inaction, would permit any Member to allege an impact on the dignity of the House based upon virtually any legislative action or inaction.

The Chair would not distinguish between those precedents addressing res-

olutions that called for specific legislative action and a resolution that merely provided a statement about such action. Both express a legislative sentiment and are properly initiated through the introduction of a resolution via the hopper.

For these reasons, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida does not constitute a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to explain why the Chair is wrong and to finish my argument.

Mr. SESSIONS. Objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 373, by the yeas and nays; and

Adopting House Resolution 373, if ordered.

The first vote will be conducted as a 15 minute vote. The second vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 89, EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3273, DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 90, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 373) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

#### YEAS—226

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Petri
Amash	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Amodei	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Grimm	Pompeo
Barletta	Guthrie	Posey
Barr	Hall	Price (GA)
Barton	Hanna	Radel
Benishek	Harper	Reed
Bentivolio	Harris	Reichert
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Black	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Hensarling	Rigell
Boustany	Holding	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rokita
Buchanan	Hurt	Rooney
Bucshon	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Jenkins	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Campbell	Jones	Royce
Capito	Jordan	Runyan
Carter	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scalise
Coble	Kingston	Schock
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sessions
Conaway	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cook	Lance	Shuster
Cotton	Lankford	Simpson
Cramer	Latham	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Latta	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Long	Smith (TX)
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Stewart
Denham	Marchant	Stivers
Dent	Marino	Stockman
DeSantis	Massie	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McClintock	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Tipton
Ellmers	McKinley	Turner
Farenthold	McMorris	Upton
Fincher	Rodgers	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Wagner
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walberg
Fleming	Messer	Walden
Flores	Mica	Walorski
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gerlach	Noem	Wittman
Gibbs	Nugent	Wolf
Gibson	Nunes	Womack
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Woodall
Gohmert	Olson	Yoder
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Yoho
Gosar	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Pearce	Young (IN)
Granger	Perry	

#### NAYS—186

Andrews	Capuano	Cuellar
Barber	Cárdenas	Cummings
Barrow (GA)	Carney	Davis (CA)
Bass	Carson (IN)	Davis, Danny
Beatty	Cartwright	DeFazio
Becerra	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Bera (CA)	Castro (TX)	Delaney
Bishop (GA)	Chu	DeLauro
Bishop (NY)	Cicilline	DelBene
Blumenauer	Clarke	Deutch
Bonamici	Cleaver	Dingell
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Doggett
Braley (IA)	Cohen	Doyle
Brown (FL)	Connolly	Duckworth
Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Edwards
Bustos	Cooper	Engel
Butterfield	Costa	Enyart
Capps	Courtney	Eshoo

Esty	Lujan Grisham	Roybal-Allard	DeSantis	Kingston	Roby	McCollum	Peterson	Slaughter
Farr	(NM)	Ruiz	DesJarlais	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)	McDermott	Pingree (ME)	Smith (WA)
Fattah	Luján, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger	Diaz-Balart	Kline	Rogers (KY)	McGovern	Pocan	Speier
Foster	(NM)	Ryan (OH)	Duffy	Labrador	Rogers (MI)	McIntyre	Polis	Swalwell (CA)
Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda	Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher	McNerney	Price (NC)	Takano
Fudge	Maffei	T.	Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Rokita	Meeks	Quigley	Thompson (CA)
Gabbard	Maloney,	Sanchez, Loretta	Elmers	Lance	Rooney	Meng	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
Garamendi	Carolyn	Sarbanes	Farenthold	Lankford	Ros-Lehtinen	Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
García	Maloney, Sean	Schiff	Fincher	Latham	Roskam	Miller, George	Ruiz	Titus
Grayson	Matheson	Schneider	Fitzpatrick	Latta	Ross	Moore	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Green, Gene	Matsui	Schrader	Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Rothfus	Moran	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Hahn	McCollum	Schwartz	Fleming	Long	Royce	Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Hanabusa	McDermott	Scott (VA)	Flores	Luetkemeyer	Runyan	Nadler	T.	Vargas
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Serrano	Forbes	Lummis	Ryan (WI)	Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey
Heck (WA)	McIntyre	Sewell (AL)	Fortenberry	Marchant	Salmon	Neal	Sarbanes	Vela
Himes	McNerney	Shea-Porter	Fox	Marino	Sanford	Negrete McLeod	Schiff	Velázquez
Hinojosa	Meeks	Sherman	Franks (AZ)	Massie	Scalise	Nolan	Schneider	Walz
Holt	Meng	Sinema	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Schock	O'Rourke	Schrader	Visclosky
Honda	Michaud	Sires	Gardner	McCauley	Schweikert	Owens	Schwartz	Wagner
Horsford	Miller, George	Slaught	Garrett	McClintock	Scott, Austin	Pallone	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Hoyer	Moore	Smith (WA)	Gerlach	McHenry	Sensenbrenner	Pascarell	Scott, David	Schultz
Huffman	Moran	Speier	Gibbs	McKeon	Sessions	Pastor (AZ)	Serrano	Waters
Israel	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell (CA)	Gibson	McKinley	Shimkus	Payne	Sewell (AL)	Watt
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Takano	Gingrey (GA)	McMorris	Shuster	Pelosi	Shea-Porter	Waxman
Jeffries	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)	Gohmert	Rodgers	Simpson	Perlmutter	Sherman	Welch
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Thompson (MS)	Goodlatte	Meadows	Smith (MO)	Peters (CA)	Sinema	Wilson (FL)
Johnson, E. B.	Negrete McLeod	Tierney	Gosar	Meehan	Smith (NE)	Peters (MI)	Sires	Yarmuth
Kaptur	Nolan	Titus	Gowdy	Messer	Smith (NJ)			
Keating	O'Rourke	Titus	Granger	Mica	Smith (TX)			
Kelly (IL)	Owens	Tonko	Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Southerland	Clay	Gutiérrez	Rangel
Kennedy	Pallone	Tsongas	Graves (MO)	Miller (MI)	Stewart	Crowley	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Kildee	Pascarell	Van Hollen	Griffin (AR)	Miller, Gary	Stivers	Ellison	Higgins	Rush
Kilmer	Pastor (AZ)	Vargas	Griffith (VA)	Mullin	Stockman	Gallo	Lewis	Schakowsky
Kind	Payne	Veasey	Grimm	Mulvaney	Stutzman	Green, Al	Lucas	Westmoreland
Kirkpatrick	Pelosi	Vela	Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Terry	Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Kuster	Perlmutter	Velázquez	Hall	Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)			
Langevin	Peters (CA)	Visclosky	Hanna	Noem	Thornberry			
Larsen (WA)	Peters (MI)	Walz	Harper	Nugent	Tiberi			
Larsen (CT)	Peterson	Wasserman	Harris	Nunes	Tipton			
Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Schultz	Hartzler	Nunnelee	Turner			
Levin	Pocan	Waters	Hastings (WA)	Olson	Upton			
Lipinski	Polis	Watt	Heck (NV)	Palazzo	Valadao			
Loeb sack	Price (NC)	Waxman	Hensarling	Paulsen	Wagner			
Lofgren	Quigley	Welch	Holding	Pearce	Walberg			
Lowenthal	Rahall	Wilson (FL)	Hudson	Perry	Walden			
Lowe	Richmond	Yarmuth	Huelskamp	Petri	Walorski			
			Huizenga (MI)	Pittenger	Weber (TX)			
			Hultgren	Pitts	Webster (FL)			
			Hunter	Poe (TX)	Wenstrup			
			Hurt	Pompeo	Whitfield			
			Issa	Posey	Williams			
			Jenkins	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)			
			Johnson (OH)	Radel	Wittman			
			Johnson, Sam	Rahall	Wolf			
			Jones	Reed	Womack			
			Jordan	Reichert	Woodall			
			Joyce	Renacci	Yoder			
			Kelly (PA)	Ribble	Yoho			
			King (IA)	Rice (SC)	Young (AK)			
			King (NY)	Rigell	Young (IN)			

## NOT VOTING—19

Cantor	Gutiérrez	Rogers (AL)
Clay	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Crowley	Higgins	Schakowsky
Ellison	Lewis	Scott, David
Gallo	Lucas	Young (FL)
Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	
Grijalva	Rangel	

□ 1727

So the previous question was ordered.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 186, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

## AYES—227

Aderholt	Bridenstine	Coble
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Bachmann	Broun (GA)	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Barletta	Bucshon	Conaway
Barr	Burgess	Cook
Barton	Calvert	Cotton
Benishek	Camp	Cramer
Bentivolio	Campbell	Crawford
Billrakis	Cantor	Crenshaw
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Culberson
Black	Carter	Daines
Blackburn	Cassidy	Davis, Rodney
Boustany	Chabot	Denham
Brady (TX)	Chaffetz	Dent

Andrews	Cummins	Hoyer
Barber	Davis (CA)	Huffman
Barrow (GA)	Davis, Danny	Israel
Bass	DeFazio	Jackson Lee
Beatty	DeGette	Jeffries
Becerra	Delaney	Johnson (GA)
Bera (CA)	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Kaptur
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Keating
Blumenauer	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Bonamici	Doggett	Kennedy
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Kildee
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Kilmer
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Kind
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Bustos	Enyart	Kuster
Butterfield	Eshoo	Langevin
Capps	Esty	Larsen (WA)
Capuano	Farr	Larsen (CT)
Cárdenas	Fattah	Lee (CA)
Carney	Foster	Levin
Carlson (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Cartwright	Fudge	Loeb sack
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Lofgren
Castro (TX)	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Chu	García	Lowey
Cicilline	Grayson	Lujan Grisham
Clarke	Green, Gene	(NM)
Cleaver	Hahn	Luján, Ben Ray
Clyburn	Hanabusa	(NM)
Cohen	Hastings (FL)	Lynch
Connolly	Heck (WA)	Maffei
Conyers	Himes	Maloney,
Cooper	Hinojosa	Carolyn
Costa	Holt	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Honda	Matsui
Cuellar	Horsford	

## NOES—186

Cummins	Hoyer
Davis (CA)	Huffman
Davis, Danny	Israel
DeFazio	Jackson Lee
DeGette	Jeffries
Delaney	Johnson (GA)
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
DelBene	Kaptur
Deutch	Keating
Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Doggett	Kennedy
Doyle	Kildee
Duckworth	Kilmer
Edwards	Kind
Engel	Kirkpatrick
Enyart	Kuster
Eshoo	Langevin
Esty	Larsen (WA)
Farr	Larsen (CT)
Fattah	Lee (CA)
Foster	Levin
Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Fudge	Loeb sack
Gabbard	Lofgren
Garamendi	Lowenthal
García	Lowey
Grayson	Lujan Grisham
Green, Gene	(NM)
Hahn	Luján, Ben Ray
Hanabusa	(NM)
Hastings (FL)	Lynch
Heck (WA)	Maffei
Himes	Maloney,
Hinojosa	Carolyn
Holt	Maloney, Sean
Honda	Matsui
Horsford	

## NOT VOTING—18

Clay	Gutiérrez	Rangel
Crowley	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Ellison	Higgins	Rush
Gallo	Lewis	Schakowsky
Green, Al	Lucas	Westmoreland
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1735

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was detained and missed the following votes:

1. Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 89, H.R. 3273 and H.J. Res. 90—Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on this bill.

2. H. Res 373—Rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 89—Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act, H.R. 3273 Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act, and H.J. Res. 90—Federal Aviation Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on this bill.

## EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 373, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 89

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. Such amounts as may be necessary for paying salaries and related expenses of Federal employees excepted from the provisions of the Antideficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1341 et seq.) who work during the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 15, 2013, when there is otherwise no funding authority for such salaries and related expenses: *Provided*, That not later than December 20, 2013, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report specifying the use of funds made available to the Executive Branch by this joint resolution.

SEC. 102. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 103. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Excepted Employees' Pay Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 89, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, the legislation that I bring before the House today is very simple. It's very straightforward. It's very clear, very understandable, and, quite frankly, I think it should be noncontroversial; because what this bill does is simply say that the Federal employees who have been working during this shutdown are going to be paid, and they are going to be paid on time.

Now, a lot of people during this shutdown have been coming to work every

day. They've worked for countless hours for the citizens of our Nation, and they deserve to be paid. As I said, it's very simple. If you work, you get paid.

For instance, the Capitol Police, they're on the job. They're working every day. You might remember last week, they rushed into harm's way in the line of duty. Now, those Federal employees deserve to take home a paycheck because they're on the job.

There are other Federal workers that are working every day during this shutdown. Some of them are working to make sure that our safety and well-being is in place. Some are working to make sure that the critical needs of our citizens are met. Some are working to make sure that businesses aren't unduly harmed during this shutdown, and some are working to make sure that the Federal Government extends a helping hand to those people that are the most vulnerable and are truly in need.

So what this bill does is simply say, as long as this shutdown is going on, until it ends, the people that come to work every day deserve to be paid. They deserve to be paid on time. Remember, the people who come to work every day, they're just like everybody else. They've got bills to pay. They've got mortgage payments they've got to make. They've got to pay their rent. They've got to make car payments. They've got to pay their utility bills. They've got mouths to feed back home. There is no reason that they should be punished because the Democrats and the Republicans and the White House can't agree how to move forward on funding the Federal Government.

Now, it's the goal of this Congress, as always, to make sure that Federal employees are paid and they're paid on time, and we usually do that by passing appropriations bills, and we do that. We fund the programs, and the salaries are paid on a continuing basis. We usually do that by the end of the fiscal year. It didn't happen this year, and I hope we don't find ourselves in this position ever again. But right now, it's time to come together. This is a logical, commonsense step to take—to make sure the people that go to work every day get paid on time.

We came together on Saturday, this weekend, on a unanimous vote, and said that those Federal employees who have been furloughed would be paid on a retroactive basis. It's my hope that we can come together today on a unanimous vote and say the people that go to work are going to get paid on time.

So I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution; and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me start by saying that I wish we were here on the floor today in order to consider a bill that would reopen the entire Federal Government.

This bill would pay all excepted Federal employees across the Federal Gov-

ernment as they would normally be paid irrespective of the shutdown. This is the right thing to do for all of our excepted Federal employees who have continued to work during the shutdown.

□ 1745

While this bill will provide some certainty to those individuals, we all know that there is a much easier and better method of accomplishing this goal, and that is to consider and pass the clean Senate continuing resolution which would reopen our Federal Government immediately.

I'm still unclear as to why Republicans are refusing to allow a vote on the most basic solution to this reckless shutdown.

While this bill guarantees timely pay for our employees, it does not reopen the Federal Government. That means it does nothing to solve the many problems the American people are facing as a result of the Republican decision to shut down the government.

Within the subcommittee that I am the ranking member of, the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee, the shutdown has required the Small Business Administration, for instance, to furlough almost two-thirds of its workforce. The agency has had to shutter almost all of its loan programs for our Nation's small businesses, including loan programs for veterans, women-owned small businesses, and small businesses located in underserved areas.

Within the Federal judiciary, the Federal defenders currently have enough funding to continue operations for a couple of weeks. However, once that time is up, they may be unable to fulfill their constitutional duty to uphold the Sixth Amendment rights of criminal defendants.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission has been cut from 540 employees to 22, making it near impossible for the agency to perform its duty of fully reviewing thousands of different kinds of products. This will clearly increase the risk to the public.

The IRS has been forced to furlough most of its workforce, preventing the agency from providing taxpayer assistance to those who have questions, to examine questionable tax returns, or even to accept paper tax filings.

The IRS brings in the vast majority of our Nation's revenue, and the Republican shutdown is harming our ability to pay our bills.

The American people need a full continuing resolution so that their government can perform the many duties that remain essential to American consumers, investors, taxpayers, and small businesses. A clean CR would do just that.

I realize that the majority wants to do this piecemeal, one at a time. I think I'm doing some math, and at this rate, the full government would be open by 2025, so I'm hoping we can do it before that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. This bill addresses a critical issue facing the Congress right now. It ensures that the essential personnel who've been working throughout this shutdown receive their hard-earned pay on time.

These diligent men and women are protecting our homeland; they're ensuring our safety and well-being; they're providing critical services for our people and shielding our economy. They've been by our sides as we have worked to find a way out of the mess that we find ourselves in. They've been guarding this very building, putting themselves in harm's way. It's our responsibility to these dedicated professionals that they receive due compensation for their service to this Nation.

In addition, the House will consider a second piece of legislation this afternoon which will be combined with this bill and sent to the Senate. The second bill will provide a path forward to bring all parties to the table to end the government shutdown.

For a week, this House has been toiling, working, trying to find a way to end the impasse or at least mitigate its effects as we work toward a solution to this very serious problem.

We've provided bills that would fund the entire government and avenues to reopening certain critical government functions. We even proposed a conference committee, hoping the Senate would finally agree to talk to the House. We heard nothing.

But a week later, we're still no closer to a resolution. The Senate has turned down nearly every bill we've sent them and rejected every compromise we've offered. They've flatly refused a conference committee to attempt to find some sort of solution. After 8 days of a shutdown, it's high time that we all start having real, adult conversations about how to get out of this mess.

This second bill will establish a working group, Madam Speaker, that will provide a framework to get the House and Senate together to hash out our differences on the myriad fiscal crises that we are currently facing. If enacted, it will require, by law, Members from both Houses to meet and work our way toward a final agreement. There is far too much at stake now to be stuck in our ways. We must work together in a productive fashion if we wish to get anything accomplished.

It's imperative that we get our fiscal house in order and put our budgets on an attainable and sustainable path. We must have a common, agreed-upon, top-line discretionary spending level

with the Senate, which will allow our annual appropriations work to be completed this year.

To do this, we must enact meaningful, commonsense entitlement program reforms that will slow the monstrous growth of these auto-pilot programs. We need to ensure that they're sustainable in the future—stop them from devouring the entirety of our Federal budgets—including funding for our domestic programs and our national defense, and prevent them from plunging our Nation further into debt.

I believe that the Members of this House and of the Senate are reasonable people, people of goodwill, people who wish to do right by this country. That's why I hope that this House will approve both of these bills today.

This is the right thing to do, to help find an end to this government shutdown, to tackle our spending problems and our debt limit, and to show the people of the United States that we are here to legislate, not to pontificate. They expect and deserve no less.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill and this path forward.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my dear friend, the low-key Mr. MORAN.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend from New York, and I trust that my very good friend from Kentucky wasn't referring to anybody on this side of the aisle when he used the word "pontificate."

Obviously, Madam Speaker, on this side of the aisle we are going to vote for this bill. The Democrats never wanted to shut down any of the government in the first place.

But I want to remind my colleagues that the vast majority of Federal employees in their districts are considered nonessential. I would like for my colleagues to reflect on what that means within each individual family when a breadwinner, who has been working hard at a job—making his family proud or her family proud—comes home and has to announce that they're furloughed because they were considered to be nonessential.

Imagine if that happened in the House and, if we had to divide up between essential and nonessential, how we would feel. I know it brings smiles as it did in the caucus just a few minutes ago, but think about it.

It's wrong to have this arbitrary distinction. Ninety percent of the IRS is considered nonessential; 90 percent of the Department of Energy, 90 percent of the Environmental Protection Agency, 81 percent of the Interior Department, 70 percent of the intelligence agencies are considered non essential. They're not nonessential. They're working hard. They ought to be able to get back to their jobs. We need them to be back to their jobs.

It's very disappointing that the Senate has held up the bill that we voted for unanimously on Saturday—I hope

they'll let that loose—but the reality is, when we vote to pay people, we recognize they deserve to be paid, and if they're being paid, all of them want to be working for that pay.

So that's what we need to do. We need to open the entire government. Let everyone work for their pay as they want to do.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), an outstanding member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because people do need a paycheck. They need to be able to plan their expenses based on their income, and we have disrupted that income flow, so it makes sense to say, let's get the pay schedule back on track.

But I want to say something in a broader context that, after offering the Senate three different compromises on keeping the government open—three different compromises that were rejected—and then a fourth offer to let's immediately, last Sunday, go to a conference and start negotiating our differences, all of those were rejected; but even in that context, we have found a few things that we can agree on: the military pay bill, which not only included the men and women in uniform but the civilian support staff that they had.

As Mr. MORAN has pointed out, recently we came together again for the furloughed employees to be able to get back pay for the time in which they're out of work. Then we tried the other day to pass—and did from the House—the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, which passed the House floor on an overwhelming bipartisan basis; and we're looking at other programs that have passed, again, on a bipartisan basis, such as WIC—the Women, Infants and Children nutrition program—Head Start, Impact Aid, and we have a number of others.

Why, Madam Speaker, are those important?

Because many of us have actually chaired and participated in conference committees where House and Senate Members come together to iron out their differences. Frequently, the gap is huge, and frequently, the differences are numerous.

We know from experience that if you can start chopping those big differences into small steps, eventually you close the gap, and that is what the House Appropriations Committee, under Chairman ROGERS, is doing, and much of it with the support of Democrat House Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. But if we can get some of these things off the table—if we can agree on military pay, if we can agree on the civilian support staff for

military, if we can agree on furloughed employees, and if we can agree with NIH, that science and public health should be off the table—then, Madam Speaker, that big gap that stands between us and the Senate right now, it begins to narrow, and we create a little bit of momentum for a solution.

There are still going to be great differences that aren't going to be easy, but I think it is very important for us to come together and find the things on which we do agree, and at least move in a positive direction on them.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), one of the great gentlemen, and I mean that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I rise in strong support of paying our Federal workers, but I oppose the parliamentary gimmicks being used by the majority to consider H.J. Res. 89, which is why I voted “no” on the rule.

This resolution would ensure that the more than 1.2 million dedicated Federal employees who have been required by their agencies to work during the government shutdown will receive their paychecks on time.

So far, these committed men and women have been at their duty stations without pay for 8 days since Republican extremists took our government hostage as part of their crusade to take health care from tens of millions of our fellow citizens.

It is only fair and right that we pay them in a timely manner for the services they have rendered. These employees have mortgages, student loans, and children in college. They have to provide for their families, and they need their paychecks.

Three days ago, the House unanimously passed H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act, which would give back pay to 800,000 Federal employees furloughed as a result of this government shutdown. I understand, however, that a Republican Senator is blocking the consideration of that bill in the Senate.

Our Federal workers have endured relentless assaults over the past 3 years and have sacrificed much already. They have suffered through a 3-year pay freeze, reductions in their retirement benefits, and sequester-imposed furloughs.

It is time to stop the assault on our Federal workers. I urge the Senate to pass H.R. 3223 by unanimous consent immediately.

I support our Federal workers, and I support H.J. Res. 89, but I oppose the measure to which it will be attached upon passage, and note that by simply bringing to the floor a clean measure to fund the entire government, this bill would not be necessary.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time both sides have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 9¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 13 minutes remaining.

□ 1800

Mr. CRENSHAW. At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank Chairman CRENSHAW for yielding. I want to also thank him and Chairman ROGERS for their help today and on Saturday. I also want to thank their staffs. The staffs and leadership have been incredibly helpful in bringing this legislation to this floor.

Madam Speaker, I think if you look at the vote on Saturday, I and all Members believe that Federal employees should be paid, period. Too many Federal employees and their families don't know when their next paychecks will arrive and are worried about paying their next mortgage payments, paying utilities bills, filling up their cars with gas, or paying for their children's tuitions, which are coming up very soon. We need to fix this.

That is why I joined last week with Mr. MORAN and others in our delegation—colleagues on both sides of the aisle—to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor last Saturday to ensure that all Federal employees, whether exempt or furloughed by no fault of their own, are paid once this shutdown ends. I'm pleased that this bill passed the House 407–0.

I heard that both a Republican and a Democrat Senator had this bill on hold. I don't understand, Madam Speaker, the Senate's ways of going about this, but I think, if any Senators have a hold, they ought to feel strongly enough that they ought to do it publicly so we know who they are, but I understand it's both a Republican and a Democrat. On behalf of the people who are having a very difficult time, I would ask them to lift that hold.

Additionally, this House acted to ensure that members of the military and Defense Department civilians exempt from furloughs would be paid on time. I am pleased that the Pay Our Military Act, which the House passed by 423–0, was quickly approved by the Senate and signed into law by the President.

Today's legislation builds on these efforts by ensuring that other exempt Federal employees like the FBI team in Nairobi investigating the attack by Al-Shabaab; the CIA, which is looking at things coming in with regard to al Qaeda; the DEA, which is stopping drugs from coming into this country; the Border Patrol agents; doctors and nurses at VA hospitals; Federal firefighters; air traffic controllers; and prison guards will be paid as soon as possible. I hope the House today will follow the bipartisan precedent we have set over and over and vote for this legislation.

In closing, I know my colleagues recognize that Federal employees aren't

just nameless faces behind desks. They are real people, out in the field, who work day in and day out to keep our country safe.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to clarify that it is a gentleman of the minority party that has objected and is holding up the pay bill in the Senate.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), a great leader and the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend from New York.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely the right thing to do to make sure we pay Federal workers on time whether they're the Capitol Police or any other public servant doing the work of our country right now.

It was also the right thing to do on a bipartisan basis to make sure that Federal employees are not punished through no fault of their own. We did that unanimously by the vote on Saturday to make sure that Federal employees do not have to bear that burden when they're not the ones making the bad decisions.

What is very puzzling, Mr. Speaker, is, in having voted unanimously to say that we're going to make sure we pay those Federal employees who are being furloughed, we would at the same time block them from going back to work for the American people.

I just don't understand, Mr. Speaker, how the Speaker of the House can explain that to the American people when we have in our possession here in the people's House a piece of legislation that, if we were allowed to vote on it, could reopen the entire government right now, without preconditions.

Now, we've heard from our Republican colleagues that they want to open one little piece—let's open the national parks. Let's open another little piece—but on Saturday, what we did was vote to make sure that every Federal employee, whether they work for the national parks or any other Federal agency—everyone—would get paid for yesterday, for today, for tomorrow.

So why would our colleagues want to let one more day go by when we're compensating Federal employees and making them stay at home? Why wouldn't we open the Federal Government today so that they can do the work that we're paying them to do on behalf of the American people? It is absolutely mind-boggling, Mr. Speaker, that our Republican colleagues would take that position.

In the Senate right now you've got a Senator from Texas, Senator CORNYN, who is blocking that particular provision that we passed unanimously. I hope that he will let it go. But over here in the House, we have a bill that the President's waiting to sign right now. All we need to do is pass it, and the votes are here in the House to do it. If the Speaker doubts that fact, there's an easy way to figure it out. We all know that. Put it up for a vote.

What's the Speaker afraid of—a little democracy in this House?

So we're going to be paying all the Federal employees, as we should, because they absolutely should not be penalized—not for one day that we're forcing them to be out of work. These are men and women who are dedicated to providing service to our country. They want to get back to work, and what this House is saying is, We're going to keep paying you, but we're not going to let you go to work for the American people. That is an astounding position to take.

Let's vote to open the entire government right now. Let's take up the Senate bill. Let's get it done.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we keep saying it, and the folks who keep watching us wonder why we keep saying it—or maybe they know why we keep saying it. Little by little, you are reopening the government, but it may take until 2025 to accomplish it at this level. So our hope would be that we just pass the resolution that was passed in the Senate and open the government.

Now, this one is an easy one. Everyone is going to vote for this bill. In fact, this bill should pass on a voice vote so that we can get folks and pay them properly for the services they're rendering, but there are other people who need to come to work. There are other people who need to service the American people. There are Americans who need to be serviced, and this is not the way for us to behave.

A little bit of history—and I know that some people in the last couple of days have either refused to mention it or gave up on it—and that is that this all started not because there were differences in economic reasoning or behavior. It started because a group of people on your side wanted to attach killing ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act—and they were willing to do whatever they needed to do to accomplish that.

That's not going to happen. How many times do we have to say that bill was passed by the House, passed by the Senate, signed by the President, and upheld by the Supreme Court? I don't know how many laws you can say that about in this country that we don't go after, and yet some folks just won't give up.

The time is now for us to open up the government. The time is now for us to pass this bill, to respect our Federal workers, but also to respect the American people in general by making sure that the government is open.

Take up the resolution. It will pass in 2 seconds, I assure you. In fact, I predict that if you bring that resolution to the floor, you may be shocked to get a unanimous vote, because that's what we want to do—to open up the government and then move on to deal with the issues that we have to deal with.

So let's do it, and let's do it quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody in this Chamber wanted to see the government shut down. Nobody wanted to see it down.

As has been pointed out, we passed a continuing resolution, funded the government, sent it to the United States Senate, and they said "no." So we sent another resolution that kept the government open. The Senate said "no." A third time we sent a resolution to the United States Senate to keep the government open. The Senate said "no."

Then we said, Why don't we just sit down and talk? Why don't we have a conference committee—one of those committees that we have all the time in this body when the House and the Senate disagree. We call it a conference committee. We appoint a group from the House. They appoint a group from the Senate. We work out the differences. That's the way you resolve conflict. That's the way you move ahead.

So the House appointed eight conferees. We went to a meeting, ready to meet with the Senate. They didn't show up. So we decided they don't really want to have any negotiations about how we continue to fund the Federal Government.

Then we said, If they won't pass a continuing resolution to fund the entire Federal Government, maybe we should just take certain parts of the Federal Government and see if the United States Senate or our friends on the other side would vote in favor of doing that. Of course, everyone has voted to say we ought to keep the government running as it relates to the military—both the defense and civilian employees. So our friends on the other side decided that was a good idea, and they voted for that.

Then we said, Since the District of Columbia is being penalized by our inaction, why don't we pass a bill that says we'll appropriate the money—it's their own money—and let them spend it the way they want to spend it. We had that on a suspension vote, and our friends on the other side didn't want to do that, so they voted "no."

Then we had a bill on Saturday that talked about folks that are on furlough, and our friends on the other side said, That's a good idea. We ought to pay them retroactively.

So they've been picking and choosing, picking and choosing, and some of these bills passed. In fact, if you add up all the bills we've passed, there have been 10 bills now that keep the government running in different ways shapes, and forms—that's almost one-third of all the discretionary spending—and we passed all that.

Where are those bills? They're sitting down in the Senate, waiting for the Senate to do something.

So we find ourselves in a situation that we didn't want to be in. We're all

frustrated—people are angry—but we'll keep going. We're going to try to get the government running again. We're going to try to keep things open.

But for goodness sake, this bill before us today simply says the folks that are coming to work are doing the things that are important to our Federal Government, and they ought to get paid. If you work, you get paid, and you get paid on time. I think everybody agrees with that.

So let's not penalize them. A lot of people are being penalized because of our inaction, but let's not penalize the people who come to work every day to meet the critical needs of our country. Let's make sure that they get paid. Sooner or later, Mr. Speaker, we'll open this government back up. We've tried to do almost a third of it now. Still, people say no. We'll move ahead.

With that, I simply urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation to make sure that the people who are working get paid on time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.J. Res. 89, the Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act.

Last week the House passed support of H.R. 3223, the "Federal Employees Retroactive Pay Fairness Act," which provided for retroactive pay for nearly 800,000 federal workers who have been furloughed as a result of the government shutdown engineered by the Tea Party faction of House Republicans.

The 1.3 million "essential" civilian employees as well as those who are on Furlough share the same financial fate neither will get a paycheck if the shutdown extends beyond October 15, 2013.

Federal employees whether they are working or waiting be called back to work are all waiting on the House to honor a promissory note for agreeing to give their best in serving the people of the United States.

We promise to pay Federal employees what is owed to them. We owe them dignity and respect as well as a debt of gratitude for electing to enter into public service.

The reason we are considering another Federal employee pay bill is that the earlier bill forgot something important that the majority is trying to fix—and I agree they should fix with passage of this bill.

We have not started the debate on the Debt Ceiling, but it is time to start considering the consequences should this method of legislating continue.

The world has a promissory note that is written on every dollar bill, "This note is Legal Tender for All Debts, Public and Private."

That promissory note means that people around the world highly value our nation's currency—not having that reputation will hurt everyone in this country.

In other words our money is only as valuable as its reputation, which is why threatening not to honor our debts is more than just a light matter to be down played by PR talking points.

But to my dear friends on the other side of the aisle this is another example of why this piece-mill process to attempt to fund the Federal government is a problem and why the American public can see that this process makes no sense.



The House has members who are specialists in appropriations they serve on the House Committee on Appropriations.

According to the Rules on the House of Representatives the House Committee on Appropriations' function is the appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

The Appropriations Committee would not have forgotten to include Hill staff, which this bill will address. Hill employees include Capitol Police officers, custodial staff, and the staff of the Library of Congress.

This gesture is appreciated by these Federal government employees, but neither they nor the other federal employees promised back pay will see anything until this body passes a clean CR offered by the Senate.

The United States House of Representatives has Rules that govern how we as the people's representatives are to conduct the business of the Federal government.

The House of Representatives have been trying to put on a show for the American public by bringing bills to the floor—fast and varied though they may be they are half baked and ineffective means of funding the Federal government.

My colleagues on the other side aisle are only human—and they are going to forget something, but one of the things they should not forget is how their decisions are impacting the lives of people.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.J. Res. 89.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1815

# DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 373, I call up the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3273

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013”.

## SEC. 2. BICAMERAL WORKING GROUP ON DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a bicameral working group to be known as the “Bicameral Working Group on Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth” (hereinafter referred to as the “working group”).

(b) PURPOSE.—The working group shall recommend to the House of Representatives and the Senate—

(1) overall levels of discretionary spending, including for the fiscal year ending on September 30, 2014;

(2) changes in the statutory limit on the public debt; and

(3) reforms in direct spending programs.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) The working group shall be comprised of 20 members to be appointed as follows:

(A) The Speaker shall appoint 10 Members of the House of Representatives, of which one shall be designated as House co-chair and 4 shall be on the recommendation of the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(B) The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint 10 Senators, of which one shall be designated as Senate co-chair and 4 shall be on the recommendation of the minority leader of the Senate.

(2) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the working group shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation was made.

(3) Each appointment under this subsection shall be made not later than one calendar day after enactment of this Act.

(d) MEETINGS.—The members of the working group shall meet not later than one calendar day after their appointment pursuant to subsection (c) and shall meet on each calendar day thereafter unless both co-chairs jointly determine that there is good cause to dispense with such meeting.

(e) ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—The working group may not report any recommendation unless it receives the support of a majority of the members appointed by both the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate.

(f) REPORT.—

(1) The working group shall report its recommendations, including any legislative language required to implement those recommendations, to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 3 calendar days after their adoption.

(2) The report shall be referred in the House of Representatives by the Speaker in accordance with clause 2 of rule XIV.

(3) The report shall include any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted to the co-chairs prior to its transmission pursuant to paragraph (1).

(g) TERMINATION.—The working group shall terminate immediately after transmission of the report under subsection (f).

(h) RULEMAKING.—The provisions of this section are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supercede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3273.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It has been 1 week since the Federal Government shut down. In that time, House Republicans have passed several appropriations bills designed to provide funding for numerous parts of the government's most important functions. Additionally, we've invited Senate Democrats to join us at the negotiating table to find a commonsense solution to our Nation's fiscal problems.

Unfortunately, no one over these 3 weeks has been able to reach a compromise, and Senate Democrats have simply returned our volley every time without a value-added proposition. So what we are here to do today is to stand up once again and say we believe we are trying to appropriately fund the Federal Government.

As a result, we are here today. House Republicans are going to offer to sit down at the negotiation table with Senate Democrats in an effort to reach the meaningful solutions our constituents expect from us.

H.R. 3273, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013, would establish a bicameral, bipartisan working group consisting of six Members of the majority and four Members of the minority from both the House and the Senate. These 20 Members would be appointed no less than 1 day after enactment of the legislation and would meet each subsequent calendar day to provide recommendations to overall discretionary spending levels for fiscal year 2014, changes to the discretionary debt limit, and reforms to direct spending programs.

Mr. Speaker, being from Texas, I am used to a lot of people trying to work for the good—the common good—of its people. I will tell you that I fully expect that the reason I came to Washington was to work for the good and not for just the people of Texas, but to accept the responsibility. It was important that I come to work for all people in Texas and the American people to make their lives better. I believe that some of those ideas include sitting down, talking, negotiating, finding common ground, leading—not obstructing, not saying “no,” not being the

first one to walk out or not agreeing to meet, but, rather, to sit down and be constructive.

That is what we in the House of Representatives are trying to do once again today with a common set of principles. We believe constitutionally, as the House of Representatives, we have the authority and the responsibility to be leaders in the process that will allow the American people to effectively see who is here, who is working, and expect us to get our job done. Unfortunately, it's a rough world, and we're having a tough time, so a new idea today is to gather our colleagues together from each side and see if we can make progress.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Texas, who yielded the time.

I rise today obviously in strong opposition to this measure. I would say to my friend, I just heard him just a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, say that the people from Texas sent him here to do things. Well, the people from Florida sent me here to do things just like him. There are 435 Members in this institution, in addition to delegates from around our territories, and each one of them has an unequivocal and clear understanding about how to go about budgeting in this particular matter.

Forming a working group is forming another group up above that group. I don't need that, and I don't believe he needs that. I don't need it. Evidently, we haven't done very well when we've had it. From the newspapers today, I gathered that we had a Simpson-Bowles Commission, which people forget was the legacy of the 2010 debt ceiling increase. We had the Domenici-Rivlin commission. We had the Cantor-Biden talks. We had the Obama-Boehner debt ceiling negotiation, the Gang of Six talks, the supercommittee, and then the Obama-Boehner fiscal cliff talks. Not one of them worked, and this mess isn't going to work either.

It's sort of like, Mr. Speaker, moving the hostages, since they're taking them one by one here with this rifle-shot approach to legislating, when, in fact, all they have to do is put a clean CR on the floor and we could pass it, and they know that. But basically what they're doing is saying, Okay, we're going to take some hostages over here; then we're going to put them in another room with some more people so that they can talk to them.

I said in the Rules Committee, and I repeat: this is a gimmick wrapped in a con inside a scam, and nothing tells me anything different about my friends across the aisle who've offered gimmick after gimmick instead of doing what they know is right.

We can open the government, and that's easy to do. We can put Ameri-

cans back to work, and that's easy to do. We can keep our country from defaulting on its obligations. This measure will do none of those things, not one of them.

In all that talk about the President, the President made it very clear today that he's willing to negotiate. Evidently—and I picked up on this—my friends on the other side must have poll-tested conversation. Well, conversation allows, among other things, that you have an exploratory understanding with people in an informal setting.

What have we been talking about around here for 2 years? We've been talking about this mess. This didn't just come up last night or the day before yesterday. Democrats have already offered seven times to take up the Senate-passed continuing resolution. The House GOP has blocked a vote on the measure each and every time. For 6 months, we've been asking these people to conference.

To the House Republican leadership I say, Mr. Speaker, let us vote on a clean CR. Let us raise the debt ceiling. Why prolong this shutdown when you know that the votes are here in the House of Representatives?

My friends across the aisle know they've made a mistake. The goalposts have not only moved; they have vanished completely from the field. First, they want to defund ObamaCare. Then they only want to delay ObamaCare. Then when that didn't work, they said, well, we don't want to shut the government down, so let's open it up piece by piece. Evidently, that isn't working either, so they're now down here, moaning and groaning about the fact that the Senate isn't going to take up something that's foolish because they've made it clear that they want this to be a measure that's not a part of any negotiations or conversation; and the President made it clear that he will converse with anybody about anything but not with a gun at his head and not with the kind of undertaking that you are going forward here.

So now it's a working group, another supercommittee. How did that work out for you the last time, I ask my friends, if you would, Mr. Speaker?

So tell me, where does it all end? In all seriousness, what do my friends across the aisle hope to achieve?

Speaker BOEHNER has said: "My goal here is to have a serious conversation"—he said it 27 times "conversation" on Sunday; I was looking at him when he said it—"about those things that are driving the deficit and driving the debt up, and the President's refusal to sit down and have a conversation about this is putting our Nation at risk of default."

At 11:38 today, the President's office issued a statement wherein they had a conversation today with JOHN BOEHNER, in essence, telling him virtually that we can do this with a clean CR.

What have we been talking about? Why are we even here? What are we

talking about now? Are we having a conversation, or are we just talking past each other here in the House of Representatives? Republicans have shut down the Federal Government and taken us to the brink of a global economic catastrophe because, evidently, they want to have a conversation that we are already in the middle of.

Guess what? The Senate CR is at the levels you wanted—\$986 billion. That's what they voted on. Sequestration is the law, as my friend from Georgia is fond of saying, "the law of the land." You've already gotten what you wanted. Let's just vote on a clean CR. Let us raise the debt ceiling. This shutdown and looming debt ceiling breach are failures of the majority's leadership to stand up against the extremists within their own party, elected on a platform of obstructionism that borders on insurrection.

Leaders, you say on the other side, must be strong. Leaders must be courageous. This has become not a democracy that was intended by Jefferson and Madison and Adams and all of those that were our Founders, the Franklins and the Washingtons. They founded a democracy in spite of their divisions. They did not want to have mobocracy. That's what you've allowed to stand up in your part of this institution, a mob.

Mr. Speaker, let us end these games with a strong bipartisan message. We can show the rest of the world that the United States is ready to end its political brinksmanship.

When I was a child and I would speak out of turn, my dad and my grandmother would say: Sit down and shut up. We don't need a shutdown. We don't need people being shut out. What we need to do is shut up and let the American people cause us to listen to them and go about the business of bringing a clean CR down here. That's what I'm hearing from the American people, both Republican and Democrat, liberal and conservative, that they want us to sit down and shut up and open up this government with a clean CR.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party hears the gentleman. We are also listening to the American people. The American people are sick and worried about their future. They see a government that spends too much money and listens too little. They tax too much and leave too little for the American people. They are very aware that this Big Government ploy and play by not just this administration, but the prior administration that ran this House of Representatives, placed America in a detrimental position, in a position where we have health care that is a government-run health care plan, that is causing not just uncertainty, but unemployment. Republicans got into this whole mess of the debate with ObamaCare because it got closer and closer and closer to implementation.

Let's look at what this bill tactically does. It tactically puts rules and regulations on business. That means that business arbitrarily will make decisions literally to cut not only the amount of people that they have, but the work hours associated with that. Many unions across the United States are concerned about the loss of the 40-hour workweek because that's the threshold that Democrats have placed the American worker in.

So the Republican Party, in listening not just to business, but workers, made a determination that the closer we got to this implementation, we were going to continue discussing how bad this was for not just business, but for individuals.

Then the President came and unilaterally decided he would let businesses be deferred for a year, but kept the rules and regulations on individuals. That was done over Fourth of July, just in a tweet that went out. They weren't even brave enough to put the full announcement out.

So now the Republicans have focused since the Fourth of July on the unfairness about how individuals will be expected to apply all of these laws directly on them as individuals. See, what the American people understand is, it is almost impossible to fight as an individual against a big government, against the IRS, and it's the IRS who will be making sure that the American people follow this tax law.

□ 1830

That is what the Supreme Court said it is. It is a tax law.

That is where lots of groups around the country continue to speak, not only clearly, but with effectiveness, about how it is unfair for the President to give 1,200 waivers and a waiver to certain people who were included in the bill—business—and now he is going to waive that but put it off on individuals.

These are small business owners. They are men and women who are not just our neighbors. They are men and women who produce the goods and services, who put their name on their businesses, who have their children become teachers and firefighters and members of our military.

They see where this is harming their ability to have health care. It is harming their ability to have the opportunity for their small business to be successful because it is putting them at a disadvantage. Perhaps worst of all, there are lots of businesses who understand that this will cost an incredible amount of money, and that is why businesses will not offer the exact same health care plan that they had previously—UPS, all the way to Delta Air Lines, and lots of other companies.

That is why it is very timely—it is very timely—that Republicans have been doing this all year, but we focused on this directly at the implementation.

We are here for a good reason. We are trying to now change the dynamics with a working group. We are trying to

say we believe that some of our colleagues would have a better opportunity to negotiate with some good ideas. Trust me, there are good ideas that float back and forth between Republicans and Democrats all the time. We are trying to say that a successful "rain dance" has a lot to do with timing.

That success can be accepting this working group, getting our Members together on a bipartisan basis—House and Senate—immediately within a day or so, and then start working together. Do you know what? Even if they weren't the final answer, what a great opportunity to empower our Members to talk and work together and see if they can make headway.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell both sides how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the Speaker.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. NITA LOWEY, my good friend and an appropriator supreme.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, a quick review of the facts makes clear that Republicans are revising history when they claim Democrats refuse to negotiate.

A headline yesterday from National Journal sums it up:

Nineteen Times Democrats Tried to Negotiate With Republicans: The GOP's biggest talking point of the shutdown is only true if you ignore everything that has happened before last weekend.

House Republicans' failure to negotiate includes: their leadership walking out of negotiations last December; ignoring the President's \$4 trillion deficit reduction plan; refusing for months to negotiate on the budget with the Senate; and now denying the House a vote to end the shutdown after Democrats agreed to their spending levels.

Of course we will work with you, my friends, on honest efforts. President Obama signed a bipartisan \$2.5 trillion deficit reduction law, and the deficit today is half of what it was in 2009. We are willing partners who will compromise.

But to suggest that we need a special committee to tell us what we already know is just not sincere. This bill is an attempt to shift blame for this shutdown. Speaker BOEHNER should stop trying to find somebody else to do his job. He can end the shutdown today by allowing a vote on the Republican-written and Senate-passed CR, which would get a majority vote in the House and be signed by the President.

Reopen the government. Do not jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States. Stop wasting time on political stunts like this bill while Americans suffer. Vote "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would thankfully acknowledge the floor of the House of Representatives here for voting on several very, very important items that allow those employees that today might not be at work. We have asked that they come back to work, and it was passed here—those in food and drug security, those in Head Start, those in national emergency disaster recovery, those in the NIH, and those in national parks.

These are an example of the ideas that have come forth from votes on this floor. And soon to come—intelligence, border security, Native Americans, and Alaskan health care, national weather monitoring, nuclear weapons security, and nutrition assistance for women and children.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I put to you most sincerely: Do you not feel that by cherry-picking what it is that you want to do with these rifle shots, that it is causing a morale problem in the rest of the government?

Let's assume that you have 150 that you are going to do, and the group that would be going back to work the latest would be sometime the week after next or sometime 2 weeks from there.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman for asking. My dear friend, very respectfully, has asked a good question.

As a matter of fact, we would like to move forward with all 150 as quickly as possible. What we would like to do is move through these. We've got them now. They are lined up to go to our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol. But they don't want to do that.

Why would I move forward if they don't want to do that? Why would we move forward if they do not actually really want to open up the government except under their terms?

We believe that they have not addressed the underlying problems:

Number one, what is happening with this thing called ObamaCare, and secondly, with the debt? We are adding debt as we speak. We have gone from \$9- to \$17 trillion in just a few short years.

We have been working with the President. We have been doing things in the 3 years that Republicans have been back in the majority. We are trying to correct the errors of the past. That is why we are here today.

The gentleman asked a good question: Wouldn't it be a good thing to get through our list of 150? I would say to the gentleman, we have already done some and we will keep doing them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. In the vernacular, they just say "bring it." Put all 150 of them down here and we would have a clean CR.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), one of the most distinguished Members that has served in the House of Representatives, my good friend, the minority whip of my party, who may very well answer that question that I asked about morale.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman pointed out, the morale is low for approximately 315 million people who call America home; low because they see a dysfunctional board of directors of their country; low because they are anguished about the inability to come to grips with reality.

I want to tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee, we said "yes." You sent us a bill to the United States Senate, which we control, and you said, Let us open government, and we will open it on the condition that we cap spending at \$986 billion.

Now, you also put another piece on that bill which said we ought to defund ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act, as we call it. I venture to say that close to 90, maybe even 100 percent, on your side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman—I say to him, Mr. Speaker—didn't think that was going to happen. They said it because they feel strongly, Mr. Speaker, about that. I understand that. I have strong feelings myself.

Now, the gentleman, my colleague from Maryland, I hope is going to use the analogy about "vetoing" the debt limit because it is a good one. But I will tell my friend the Senate said "yes" and sent it back here.

We could open the government this evening if only you would accept what you suggested, if only you would say, "Yes, you agreed with our number."

There was no negotiation, there was no compromise on our side. There was a saying to you: We want to keep the government open, so yes. Our Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate said, Mr. Speaker, we will take your number. America needs to know that we have said "yes" to the number that you suggested.

I don't like your number. I think it is not good for America, Mr. Speaker. I think it is not good for our national security, for our economy, or for the morale of the American people long term.

Having said that, I want government open, so we have said "yes" to your number. We didn't negotiate. We said, "We will take what you propose."

Mr. Speaker, I hope every American understands that when one side says, "We'll take your number," that there ought to be an agreement.

Now, I rise in opposition to this bill that has been put on the floor, which is another way to distract from the business at hand—opening up our government. Eight days from now our government will be in a position for the first time in history where we won't be able to pay our bills. The wealthiest Nation

on the face of the Earth, the most creditworthy Nation on the face of the Earth, will be in a position not that we don't have the resources, not that we don't have the credit to borrow to make sure that we continue to be able to pay our bills—that won't be the case. It will be the case that we don't have the authority to do so because this Congress has not acted.

I tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, who chairs the Rules Committee and whose father served with such distinction as the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. The present head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. Comey, says that this sequester and budget number will deeply hurt law enforcement in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to my colleagues, let's defeat this bill, and let's move to the business that is real, that will make a difference, not make a political point. Let us move to doing the business of America and put the people's government back to work, not pretend that we are going to do it by some supercommittee. We tried that. It didn't work very well. I am sorry about that. I urged them to stay in business and do their job.

I ask my colleagues, defeat this, move to the business of America, put the people's government back to work.

Mr. Speaker, this House has a responsibility to reopen government.

We can vote on a bill within the hour that would reopen the entire government—and we know the votes are there to pass it.

Two hundred Democrats are on record that we will vote to reopen the government, and there are media reports that twenty-five Republicans will do so as well.

So let's find out: put a bill on the floor to reopen government, and let the House work its will.

Democrats are also ready to work with republicans to prevent a default.

Once we end the shutdown and remove the threat of default, Democrats want to sit down and talk in a bipartisan way—as we have asked to do for months—and work out a long-term solution to our nation's fiscal challenges.

But the plan on the floor today won't do that.

It is a pretense, not a substantive action.

It does not reopen government, nor does it ensure America pays its bills.

And it is not a real mechanism to reach a broader agreement on fiscal issues.

It does not have a deadline for action—nor does it require a vote on any recommendations the committee would produce.

And, it is not a balanced approach, as it precludes the consideration of any new revenue whatsoever.

This is just more of the same from the Tea Party-driven Republican conference that isn't serious about reducing the deficit in a balanced and sustainable way.

Instead of wasting more time on these reckless and irresponsible gimmicks, we ought to be taking responsible steps to end the shut-

down, prevent a default, and then work together to achieve real, long-term fiscal solutions.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the gentleman knows, there are few people in this House who I have a better relationship than I do with the gentleman from Maryland. With great respect, I listened to him and his words.

I would say back to him there is a little bit more that really comes to us from people who speak about their lives also. I am concerned about people who are not only working for our great government and people who receive services, but we are also trying—without to make a point—we are trying to make changes in the Affordable Care Act, which is also known as ObamaCare.

□ 1845

There are several things about the Affordable Care Act that render that title difficult to understand, because the Affordable Care Act, within a year the Congressional Budget Office said they believed it would be at least twice as expensive as it was originally thought it would be.

Secondly, some 70 percent more people will be in the system because they provided a figure that did not match what they expect now for people to be in it from people who moved off of their worker plans, their insurance plans.

Third, the President stood right here one State of the Union and said there won't be a dime of taxpayer money.

And lastly, the President of the United States said:

And if you like your insurance, I guarantee you, you can keep it.

But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened since then is this administration was incapable of providing information about how this would work. And even to today, after the announcement was made, people are going onto the Web site and learning more about these exchanges.

The largest cardiology group in America, cardiologists—heart doctors—were not even included or asked to be in the exchange. Not even given a chance to say no, thank you, the largest cardiology group in America.

So now the American people are looking at it and saying, my doctor's not even included, so who is included because my doctor is not, and now I am looking at this plan that is very expensive. Granted, New York City, the State of New York was less because they had a very expensive plan, and it's true in some places it is less. But the best doctors or the doctors that people went to are not even included in those plans now. As an example, as I said, the largest cardiology group, the most experienced cardiologists, the ones you want to go to for Medicare, for Medicaid, and for your health insurance, are not even going to be included in the government plan.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is just one example about the disappointment that the American people have because they were told one thing, and they're going to get something else. Because you're fighting the government, we have to do it in such a public way. If we simply followed the law, and the contract or the express contract did not equal what came out the other end, you could go to court and sue for it. But you can't sue the government over this. So we are litigating this actually, Mr. Speaker, right before your eyes in a very public way, saying that we believe this health care, known as ObamaCare, should not be entered into lightly.

We better understand what we're doing, and we're asking for a lot of changes. Those changes are: we think we ought to delay it; we think we ought to defer it; we think we ought to wait on it. We have, in essence, backed up every single time from our demand, and now we've gotten to a point where we, as Republicans in our discussion through legislation with the Senate, have now gotten to the point where we've said, We are where we're going to be. Now we're going to try and open up the government and we're going to try and make it work. That's the facts of the case, and that's just the way it is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were here about the working group, but it does come out in the wash: we really are here about ObamaCare.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida. As the gentleman said, we discovered right now that the government is still shut down because our Republican colleagues want to repeal the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, when in fact we could open the government right now by passing the bill that's in our possession.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about negotiation because the President and the Democrats in Congress have been trying to have a budget negotiation with our Republican colleagues all year long. In fact, in March, the House passed its budget, and in March, the Senate passed its budget. And just like the textbook says, you're then supposed to have a negotiation between the House and the Senate to negotiate your differences to reach a compromise. What happened? The Speaker of the House refused to appoint negotiators from the House. We tried three times to get a vote; each time the Speaker said "no."

In the United States Senate, on 18 occasions, in fact 19 now, the Democratic leader and Senator MURRAY tried to get consent to have a budget negotiation between the House and Senate. On 18 occasions, Senate Republicans said "no." They didn't want to talk. They didn't want to negotiate. So the clock

ticked until we got down to government shutdown. And then what happened?

The Speaker of the House and the Senate Democratic leader had a negotiation. On Sunday on national television, the Speaker of the House told the country that he had a negotiation with Senator REID. They had gotten a deal. But guess what? The Speaker reneged on the agreement. Why? He told us that, too. He couldn't sell it to a reckless faction of his own party. He wanted to allow that faction of the party to run the country and shut down the government.

Now what are our Republican colleagues saying? That they're not going to let us pay our bills on time unless we adopt the Republican budget agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleagues—and I think this is an important question for the country—if the President of the United States said that he would veto a debt ceiling bill, that he would veto legislation to pay the country's bills on time unless Republicans adopted the President's budget and the President's agenda, our Republican colleagues would say he'd lost his mind. Our Republican colleagues would probably start impeachment proceedings. And yet, that's exactly what they're doing. They're saying that they won't take responsibility in joining us to pay our country's bills on time unless we adopt the Republican budget agenda unless we say let's get rid of the Affordable Care Act, unless we do everything their way.

Again, if the President was to take that position, you would say he was off his rocker. So now, our Republican colleagues are coming up with a fake committee where it actually sets the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentleman.

So after all this refusal to negotiate, you now want to set up a fake committee on deficit reduction where you refuse to even include the idea of reducing the deficit in part by shutting down tax breaks for big oil companies because you don't want to use one penny of revenue, even from closing tax loopholes, to reduce the debt and deficit. I hear from my colleagues how important it is to reduce the debt—and it absolutely is—but apparently it's not important enough to shut down one tax loophole for special interests.

End this sham. Vote on the Senate bill. Open the government.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, there is some truth to this. I and the Speaker and the majority leader and the whip and our conference do not want to have anything that would empower somebody to raise taxes. But we did want to empower that we would allow maybe Mr. DINGELL, the Dean of the House,

maybe Mr. VAN HOLLEN, maybe Mr. HASTINGS, to be part of a committee, a working group that would sit down with their colleagues and speak honestly—and maybe Mrs. LOWEY—speak honestly about how we get out of this mess that we all have.

And as a working group, as a working group with no dictates but how you've got to do what you're going to do, no timeframe except you have to go meet, and you've got to be successful, and it's going to be about these items. In other words, make "the big deal" the big deal. And the big deal right now is spending, debt, and how we do something to get this government back to work. That's what I think the legislation does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Well, for a week now, the Republicans said no to a CR funding the entire government unless there was defunding of health care reform. That was the bludgeon. It did not work.

So the Republicans shut down the government. It turns out that tactic was in the works for a year, as described in The New York Times yesterday:

One morning in a location the Members insist on keeping secret, came a little-noticed "blueprint to defund ObamaCare" signed by leaders of more than three dozen conservative groups. It articulated a take-no-prisoners legislative strategy that had long percolated in conservative circles: that Republicans could derail the health care overhaul if conservative lawmakers were willing to push fellow Republicans—including their cautious leaders—into cutting off financing for the entire government.

So now we have a shift. Keep the government shut down, let government not pay its bills. Why? Because the Speaker said it would be "unconditional surrender." That isn't what's needed. We don't need another supercommittee. What we need is to be allowed to vote.

This poster shows 195 Democrats willing to reopen the government; 22 Republicans on record. That's a majority of the House. Mr. Speaker, let democracy prevail. Let us vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 1¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the balance of my time to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this debate is a bizarre experience for those of us who have been urging negotiation on the budget for a year. "Take the President up on his

overture of last December," we've said to our Republican friends. "Let's go to a conference with the Senate and work out a budget." But the Republicans have steadfastly refused. They have run out the clock. And why did they do that? So that in a crisis atmosphere, they could demand a ransom for doing our basic duty—keeping the government open and paying our bills.

Well, that's extortion, and it's way over the line. We can't do that. In fact, we need to open the government. We could do it tonight. The votes are here if the Speaker would simply permit a vote. We could reopen the government immediately.

I promise you once we do our basic duty, we will be happy immediately to do what we should have been doing all along, and that is to negotiate a budget plan, a budget plan that puts everything on the table: revenues, entitlement, all categories of spending, a budget plan that secures this country's economic future and ends this charade that the Republicans have put us through here as the new fiscal year begins.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, we're here because Republicans want us to move forward with a process that is very important. We've had a number of times that the gentlewoman, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mrs. LOWEY, we've had the great young chairman from Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS, chairman of Appropriations, come up to the committee and talk very clearly about their ideas about moving forward to get things done.

□ 1900

I don't know that they would be the representatives of this body, but I bet they would be and I bet you that they could make real progress, along with, perhaps, Mr. VAN HOLLEN and others who are awesome Members on their side, Members who are committed to getting the work done.

But this is a fight, and it's a fight that goes all the way to our friends in the Senate and all the way to the President. As best I can tell you, just as I started, I will end today. I will say that today's stalemate is the making of the President. This is his making. He places his own political power, I believe, above the Constitution, wanting to dictate policies instead of negotiating them with a duly elected branch of government, and that's the House of Representatives.

I hope that the American people take note of what's happening. The President is different from his predecessors not in terms of greatness, but rather to the degree to which he's willing to sacrifice this Nation's greatness. He's willing to take us to the brink, rather than offering his negotiating skill-set and getting people together. That is what we should be about.

The Speaker of the House has literally instructed us to get a working group together, gather it on a bipartisan basis, and see if we can make progress not with the President, not with the Speaker, not with the Senate Majority Leader, but among Members of this body who we know and who we respect. Let's gather us together, and let's get together, and let's make a difference. That's what we're trying to suggest today. I will tell you that my colleagues that have been here on the floor, including the great minority whip, I believe have the ability to make this success happen if we will work together. That's what I'm for.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3273, the so-called "Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013," which establishes another supercommittee to make recommendations on spending and changes in the statutory limit on the public debt, the latest gimmick of the Tea Party dominated Republican majority to extricate themselves from the fiasco they created when they voted to shut down the government.

The bill before us is a bad idea brought up at the worst possible time. The bill seeks to recreate the 'super-committee' Frankenstein monster that failed its assigned task and ended up giving us the Frankenstein monster called sequestration.

We have been there and done that. We are not going down that road again.

Additionally, this bill is not a genuine effort to reach an agreement on budget and fiscal priorities. If that were the case, House Republicans would not have rejected the numerous requests of House and Senate Democrats over the past six months to go to conference to reach an agreement.

Let us review the record leading up to the Republican shutdown and the cost of the recklessness course of action:

\$150 million a day—The price-tag for closing down the government. In 1995, the record three-week closing cost \$1.9 billion in today's dollars.

800,000-plus—Federal employees expected to be furloughed as a result of the GOP's irresponsible shutdown.

192—The number of days House Republicans have refused to negotiate on a federal budget, setting the stage for a GOP government shutdown.

128—The number of points the Dow Jones Industrial Average dropped on Monday in reaction to the GOP shutdown.

72—Percent of American voters opposed to Congress shutting down the federal government to block implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

68—Percent of Americans who say shutting down the federal government even for a few days is a bad thing for the country.

49—Republicans who say shutting down the government over Obamacare is a big MISTAKE.

45—The number of times GOP have unsuccessfully tried to repeal or undermine Affordable Care Act.

18—The number of times Senate Republicans have blocked Senate Democrats' efforts

to go to conference and negotiate on the budget to avoid a government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are and have been willing to negotiate over honest differences—but not before House Republican vote to open the government and remove the threat of government default.

And there is an easy and verifiable way for them to demonstrate their good faith, and that is by bringing to the floor for an immediate vote on the clean CR already passed by the Senate.

The President has stated repeatedly that he will sign a clean CR. Our constituents are waiting. It is time to end the madness.

Mr. Speaker, let the House vote on H.J. Res. 59, as passed by the Senate today.

That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the federal government, and those who depend upon the services they provide.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION;

Washington, DC, October 8, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the three million members of the National Education Association (NEA) and the students they serve, we urge you to VOTE NO on The Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013 (H.R. 3273), a misguided strategy to ending this political stalemate, and instead pass a clean Continuing Resolution (CR) immediately. Votes associated with this issue may be included in the NEA Legislative Report Card for the 113th Congress.

The shutdown of the federal government has already affected countless children, working families, and seniors across the country; the longer this crisis drags on the more pain will be inflicted upon those who least deserve it. Meanwhile, H.R. 3273 seeks to create a "working group" of Senators and Representatives to discuss FY 2014 funding by attempting to achieve deficit reduction without accompanying revenue increases. Students in America's schools are bearing the brunt of this shutdown every day and require solutions now.

Instead of seeking deficit reduction on the backs of those students and working families, Congress should take a responsible, balanced approach that reflects the values that make our nation strong: investing in people, jobs, and education as the path to prosperity. By eliminating wasteful corporate tax breaks and loopholes and ensuring the wealthy are paying their fair share we can appropriately reduce our deficit. As just one example, as many as two out of three U.S. corporations paid zero in federal income taxes over much of the previous decade, according to the Government Accountability Office (GAO). The share of federal revenues coming from corporate taxes has shrunk by two-thirds in the last 50 years. This is undermining our ability to make the necessary investments in education that are sorely needed in order to return our nation to prosperity. It is time to put politics aside, do what is right for our nation, and take the balanced approach to deficit reduction widely supported by voters by calling on corporations and the very wealthy to pay their fair share.

Meanwhile, the current approach to deficit reduction without revenue increases has left us with the indiscriminate, across the board cuts of the sequester. It is long past time for Congress to reverse course from the austerity approach that included slashing education across-the-board by 5 percent this year—the equivalent of cutting nearly all education programs and Head Start by roughly \$3 billion. The level of cuts imposed



by sequestration have already taken federal funding back to pre-2004 levels while our nation's schools are serving nearly 6 million more students since that time.

There are millions of children being affected every day this shutdown continues. That is why we urge you to think of every single individual when making these funding decisions to ensure continued debates on Capitol Hill are not hurting everyday Americans and their families. We urge you to immediately pass a clean CR to ensure that the most vulnerable among us are no longer the victims of the government shutdown and we can focus back on undoing the harmful effects of the sequester.

Sincerely,

MARY KUSLER,  
*Director, Government Relations.*

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Work Group Act of 2013, I note that Sec 2 (b) implicitly calls for reductions in direct spending programs, but does not authorize the working group to consider additional revenue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am opposed.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3273 to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment

to H.R. 3273. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is a simple, straightforward improvement that I believe both sides can agree is absolutely necessary, and it is also supported by the majority of the American people. If my amendment passes, it will end this reckless and irresponsible government shutdown.

The majority claims that the bill before us right now will force the House and Senate to negotiate; but as written, this bill will do nothing of the sort. It will simply prolong the government shutdown. It will prolong the pain being done to our veterans, to the National Guard and Reserves, and to women, infants, and children; and, most importantly, this bill will prolong the pain being inflicted on our economy.

Let's be clear, this bill is a bill to nowhere. In my view, there is no one in this room right now who thinks this bill will reopen the government.

Since April, the Senate has tried 19 times to request a conference with the House; but each time, the request was blocked by Senate Republicans.

After months of stalling and preventing a budget conference, I am amazed that my friends on the other side of the aisle want us to believe that they are ready to negotiate a budget. We have had months to produce a budget that the House and Senate could agree on.

If my colleagues truly want to negotiate a budget that will move our country forward, they must vote "yes" on my amendment.

Once we have reopened the government, we can then sit down and work out a budget for the long term. We can do this in a bipartisan manner, without our economy sinking, without our constituents being hurt, and we can do it in a manner that is becoming to this House.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that Congress must get its fiscal house in order, and I believe both sides must come together to find solutions that better reflect the values of the American people; but instead of ending the shutdown, we continue to consider bills that play games.

We cannot open the entire Federal Government one bill at a time. If we continue down this path, the government will remain closed for the next 3 months.

How much damage would that do to the economy?

How many veterans would go without their benefits?

How many kids would lose Head Start funding?

How many families would go without nutritional assistance?

We cannot continue to play these games for 3 more months. The American people and the residents of my great county, Ventura County, deserve better.

We can end this insanity right now. Reopen the government. Spare the

American people the effects of this shutdown, and then come together to resolve our differences.

To put bills on the floor that pretend to take care of our Nation's critical needs, when they do not, is shameful.

I came to Congress to move our country forward, to help the families, the veterans, the small and large employers in Ventura County, to create jobs, and to invest in our future. We need to end this shutdown today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the amendment contained in the motion violates clause 7 of rule XVI, commonly referred to as the germaneness rule.

The objective of the bill under consideration is to establish a working group on deficit reduction. The amendment proposes to consider a Senate amendment to a House bill; therefore, the amendment fails the fundamental purpose test of germaneness described on page 547 of House Practice:

If the purpose or objective of an amendment is unrelated to that of the bill to which it is offered, the amendment may be held not germane.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed in the motion is not germane to the bill, and I respectfully request a ruling from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I request to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized on the point of order.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us set up a commission to examine deficit reduction?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that our taxpayers can receive the benefits they have already paid for. The recommit deals with government expenditures, and right now we are running a deficit. So isn't the amount the government is spending a relevant topic to deficit reduction?

Can the Chair explain why it's not germane to open up the entire Federal Government while we discuss deficit reduction?

Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not have a chance to keep the entire Federal Government open today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't keep the entire Federal Government open today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from California are not germane.

As recorded in section 932 of the House Rules and Manual, a general

principle of germaneness is that an amendment must relate to the subject matter under consideration.

The instant bill proposes to establish a working group composed of Members and Senators. As such, it proposes a bicameral order in the form of a joint rule.

In contrast, the instructions in the motion to recommit provide for the disposition of an extant legislative measure. As such, it proposes a special order of business of the House.

By addressing a different exercise in rulemaking than the pending bill, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if arising without further proceedings in recommendation; passage of House Joint Resolution 89; and the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Coffman	Gardner
Amash	Cole	Garrett
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Gerlach
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Bachus	Conaway	Gibson
Barletta	Cook	Gingrey (GA)
Barr	Cotton	Gohmert
Barton	Cramer	Goodlatte
Benishek	Crawford	Gosar
Bentivolio	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Bilirakis	Culberson	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Daines	Graves (GA)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Blackburn	Denham	Griffin (AR)
Boustany	Dent	Griffith (VA)
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Grimm
Bridenstine	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Hall
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Hanna
Broun (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Harris
Bucshon	Ellmers	Hartzler
Burgess	Farenthold	Hastings (WA)
Calvert	Fincher	Heck (NV)
Camp	Fitzpatrick	Hensarling
Campbell	Fleischmann	Holding
Cantor	Fleming	Hudson
Capito	Flores	Huelskamp
Carter	Forbes	Huizenga (MI)
Cassidy	Fortenberry	Hultgren
Chabot	Fox	Hunter
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Hurt
Coble	Frelinghuysen	Issa

Jenkins	Murphy (PA)	Schweikert
Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Scott, Austin
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Sensenbrenner
Jones	Nugent	Sessions
Jordan	Nunes	Shimkus
Joyce	Nunnelee	Shuster
Kelly (PA)	Olson	Simpson
King (IA)	Palazzo	Smith (MO)
King (NY)	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
Kingston	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Smith (TX)
Kline	Petri	Southerland
Labrador	Pittenger	Stewart
LaMalfa	Pitts	Stivers
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Stockman
Lance	Pompeo	Stutzman
Lankford	Posey	Terry
Latham	Price (GA)	Thompson (PA)
Latta	Radel	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Reed	Tiberi
Long	Reichert	Tipton
Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Turner
Lummis	Ribble	Upton
Marchant	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Marino	Rigell	Wagner
Massie	Roby	Walberg
McCarthy (CA)	Roe (TN)	Walden
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
McClintock	Rogers (MI)	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
McKeon	Rokita	Wenstrup
McKinley	Rooney	Westmoreland
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Rodgers	Roskam	Williams
Meadows	Ross	Wilson (SC)
Meehan	Rothfus	Wittman
Messer	Royce	Wolf
Mica	Runyan	Womack
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Woodall
Miller (MI)	Salmon	Yoder
Miller, Gary	Sanford	Yoho
Mullin	Scalise	Young (AK)
Mulvaney	Schock	Young (IN)

NAYS—194

Andrews	Enyart	Luján, Ben Ray
Barber	Eshoo	(NM)
Barrow (GA)	Esty	Lynch
Bass	Farr	Maffei
Beatty	Fattah	Maloney,
Becerra	Foster	Carolyn
Bera (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	Matheson
Bishop (NY)	Gabbard	Matsui
Blumenauer	Garamendi	McCollum
Bonamici	Garcia	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Grayson	McGovern
Braley (IA)	Green, Al	McIntyre
Brown (FL)	McNerney	Meeks
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Meng
Bustos	Gutiérrez	Michaud
Butterfield	Hahn	Miller, George
Capps	Hanabusa	Moore
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Carney	Himes	Nadler
Carson (IN)	Holt	Napolitano
Cartwright	Honda	Neal
Castor (FL)	Horsford	Negrete McLeod
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Nolan
Chu	Huffman	O'Rourke
Cicilline	Israel	Owens
Clarke	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Cleaver	Jeffries	Pascarell
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Connolly	Kaptur	Pelosi
Conyers	Keating	Perlmutter
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)
Costa	Kennedy	Peters (MI)
Courtney	Kildee	Peterson
Crowley	Kilmer	Pingree (ME)
Cuellar	Kind	Pocan
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Polis
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Price (NC)
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Quigley
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Rahall
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Rangel
Delaney	Lee (CA)	Richmond
DeLauro	Levin	Roybal-Allard
DelBene	Lewis	Ruiz
Deutch	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Loebach	Ryan (OH)
Doggett	Loftgren	Sánchez, Linda
Doyle	Lowenthal	T.
Duckworth	Lowe	Sanchez, Loretta
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Sarbanes
Ellison	(NM)	Schakowsky
Engel		

Schiff	Smith (WA)	Vela
Schneider	Speier	Velázquez
Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky
Schwartz	Takano	Walz
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Serrano	Tierney	Waters
Sewell (AL)	Titus	Watt
Shea-Porter	Tonko	Waxman
Sherman	Tsongas	Welch
Sinema	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)
Sires	Vargas	Yarmuth
Slaughter	Veasey	

NOT VOTING—10

Clay	Hinojosa	Rush
Gallego	Lucas	Young (FL)
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	
Higgins	Rogers (AL)	

□ 1933

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Messrs. KEATING, CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. COHEN and RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 197, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Daines	Hastings (WA)
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Amodei	Denham	Hensarling
Bachmann	Dent	Holding
Bachus	DeSantis	Hudson
Barletta	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
Barton	Duffy	Hultgren
Benishek	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Bentivolio	Duncan (TN)	Hurt
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Jenkins
Black	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Boustany	Fleischmann	Jordan
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Joyce
Bridenstine	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (AL)	Forbes	King (IA)
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Broun (GA)	Fox	Kingston
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Kinzinger (IL)
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Burgess	Gardner	Labrador
Calvert	Garrett	LaMalfa
Camp	Gerlach	Lamborn
Campbell	Gibbs	Lance
Cantor	Gibson	Lankford
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	Latham
Carter	Gohmert	Latta
Cassidy	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Chabot	Gosar	Long
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Coble	Granger	Lummis
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Cole	Graves (MO)	Marino
Collins (GA)	Griffin (AR)	McCarthy (CA)
Collins (NY)	Griffith (VA)	McCaul
Conaway	Grimm	McClintock
Cook	Guthrie	McHenry
Cotton	Hall	McIntyre
Cramer	Hanna	McKeon
Crawford	Harper	McKinley
Crenshaw	Harris	McMorris
Culberson	Hartzler	Rodgers

Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Radel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble

Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland

Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

Waters  
Watt

Waxman  
Welch

Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Hinojosa  
Lucas  
McCarthy (NY)  
Rogers (AL)

Clay  
Gallego  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1940

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

YEAS—420

## NAYS—197

Andrews  
Barber  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Bridenstine  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Grayson

Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Himes  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
Loebach  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Massie  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal

Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Rooney  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

Aderholt  
Amash  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Bass  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Doyle  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny

Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cartwright  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Doyle  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny

Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard

Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Harris  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Himes  
Holding  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham (NM)

Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lummis  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Radel  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southerland  
Speier  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—11

Clay	Hinojosa	Rush
Gallego	Lucas	Schweikert
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Higgins	Rogers (AL)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1948

Mrs. CAPPS changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 373, H.R. 3273 is laid on the table.

## HOUSE PASSES 10TH BIPARTISAN FUNDING BILL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, weeks ago, the administration reached out to Capitol Hill to continue budget negotiations. According to the National Journal:

Majority Leader Reid's office had a message for them: don't do it. The White House listened. The summit was nixed. And no serious talks have occurred since.

As the government shutdown stretches into its second week, the White House has embraced Reid's hard-line, no-negotiations stance—at least so far.

Unfortunately, hard-liner, non-negotiable posturing seems to be all the Senate Majority Leader knows.

Today, the House passed the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act, the 10th bipartisan stopgap funding bill to pass the House since the Federal shutdown began. The program remains a priority of the President; yet the White House just announced a veto threat on the bill—without a doubt, at the Senate Majority Leader's request. If this isn't a purely political move, I don't know what is.

I urge the Senate and the President to join 57 of my Democrat colleagues who are supporting the solutions being put forth by the House. The American people deserve as much.

## LOCAL SHUTDOWN EFFECTS

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to highlight just one of the stories that comes in here each and every day from my congressional district highlighting the unnecessary hardship the Republican government shutdown has brought upon the American people.

One of my constituents, who works in business aviation, contacted my office just this week to tell me about the burden the shutdown has had on his business and his family's bottom line.

During the government shutdown, aviation components cannot be produced, financed, bought, sold, inspected, or registered without the Federal workers that are currently furloughed. Today, large parts of this industry—and our economy at large—simply cannot function. Stories like this will continue until the House brings up the Senate CR, which funds our government at the level House Republicans fought for.

Stories like these are not isolated to upstate New York. This is happening in countless corners of our Nation and across all regions and all of our districts back home.

A piecemeal approach that picks winners and losers in our Federal agencies is no way to run the country. Bring up the Senate CR. Take “yes” for an answer. Let's get this Nation back to work.

## EQUAL JUSTICE FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. POSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, there are just two issues stopping the Obama shutdown from ending: number one, make Congress and the White House obey the same ObamaCare rules as everyone else; number two, the President let business off the hook for a year. We want workers to be let off the hook for a year, too.

That's what Republicans, Democrats, and Independents in my district all want, and that's what the Republicans ask—equal justice for all Americans. What is so hard to understand about all that? It's really that simple.

They will negotiate with Putin, Assad, and even Iran, but not with House Republicans. That's not fair. That's not right. And it's not good for the United States of America.

## BRING UP THE IMMIGRATION BILL

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I have enjoyed in this

House is sincerity. There's not a Member of this House that thinks the President of the United States is going to delay, repeal, or tear apart the Affordable Care Act; but if there's politics involved, I understand that. I'm a politician.

It just seems to me that if you have a plan, a strategy, and the whole world is saying that a handful of people are destroying the credibility of the Republican Party and therefore taking down the Democrats and the Congress with them—even the President of the United States—then I think it's safe to say it's time to look for some credibility so that we can regain being a two-party system.

So I didn't come here this morning to get arrested, but I did, because there are tens of thousands and millions of people that want to become Americans. They don't want to knock Republicans. They don't want to knock Democrats. They want to be Americans.

Bring up the immigration bill. Let's vote these new, wonderful citizens in, and maybe they can bring some sense to the parties.

## SENATE SHOULD PASS HOUSE VERSION OF CR

(Mr. CASSIDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat what my colleague from Florida said. My Democratic colleagues have suggested that if the House only passes the clean Senate CR, we can move on with business. I will point out if the Senate will only consider the House CR, we can also move on.

But the problem is that there's two provisions. One provision takes away a sweetheart deal that only Members of Congress and their staff get. Secondly, since the President delayed the mandate on employers to provide insurance for a year, we would similarly delay the mandate on the employee to have that insurance.

If she is relying upon her employer to provide the policy, what is she to do if he is given a break on not providing that policy?

We can quickly reopen the government. The House Republicans have voted a budget which would completely fund the government, but it has those provisions which Senator REID will not even negotiate over. He will not come together to discuss these two things.

So, as a favor to both our country and the American taxpayer, I ask Senator REID to address it.

## A LONG JOURNEY STARTS WITH SMALL STEPS

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, over my years in Congress, I've had the

honor of chairing several conference committees. Conference committees are set up when there's a disagreement between a House-passed bill and a Senate-passed bill. You sit down with your list of differences and you start sawing away at them, if you will.

That's, in fact, what the House has been doing the past 2 weeks in the midst of this shutdown. We've been finding some things, such as military pay, science, civilian furlough issues, and health-related issues—things that are less controversial and on which we can agree—so we can get some momentum to come up with a big agreement.

Indeed, the gap is large. We have disagreement on ObamaCare because it's one-sixth of the American economy. It's very big.

Secondly, we have a disagreement on the debt ceiling. Do we continue along the path of spending that we are on or do we make corrections?

Thirdly, we have a \$90 billion gap between our spending level between the House and the Senate.

These are big issues. Sometimes, a long journey starts with small steps. That's why I urge our friends in the Senate to pass the legislation which the House has sent over to them, and then we can start focusing on the larger issues.

□ 2000

#### OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we in Texas know that when the cattle starts stampeding, you're really in trouble; so my friends on the other side of the aisle haven't realized that the cattle in the United States is stampeding: 57,000 seats of Head Start are going; veterans centers will be closed in a couple of days; Federal courts are looking at whether or not they can stay open past October 15; U.S. attorneys are laying off various U.S. attorneys across America, up to 4,000.

We actually have rules in this House, the rules that brought about the agreement in the beginning of the year where we actually agreed to the 986 number that the Republicans had. We agreed to the tax reform that the Republicans had and Democrats agreed. But now they want to throw on us another supercommittee—fool's folly—talking about discretionary spending, the debt ceiling, and entitlement reform—all decent ideas, but open the government first.

Get the bill on the floor that is clean. Open the government. Raise the debt ceiling to pay our bills. Let the American people get back to work. Let our veterans get services. Stop throwing down another committee. We don't catch cattle. We don't go after cattle in Texas by throwing down a committee. We get it done.

Let's get the job done. Let's stop the stampede.

#### SPEAKER BOEHNER, LET YOUR PEOPLE GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, October 8. October 8. We are now 8 days into the shutdown of the government of the United States of America, presumed to be the strongest Nation on this Earth, presumed to be the greatest economic power, presumed to be the world's oldest democracy—perhaps oldest, but not functioning.

Why? Why are we in this situation? Eight days without a functioning government. What in the world is the Republican Party doing to this Nation? And why? Why? It's hard to say why because every day the goalpost changes. Every day a different demand. And today yet a new demand.

But what's the result of all of this? What does all of this mean? It means that this Nation is humiliated by this shutdown.

Speaker BOEHNER, let your people go. Speaker BOEHNER, let your people go and vote. Why not? We think there's a majority. Let's see here. There's 198 Democrats that will vote for the re-opening of this government tonight. Call us back into session, Mr. BOEHNER, 198 Democrats. And by the public record, there are 23 or more Republicans that have said they would vote for a clean CR. Mr. Speaker, let your people go and vote.

What does it mean that the government shut down? What does it mean to Americans? I'll tell you what it means in my district. It means that the day care centers, the early childhood education programs, the levee improvements, indeed, even today we've learned that the burials of those brave men and women—men, in this case—that have recently been killed in the war in Afghanistan, their families will not receive \$100,000 that's been set aside for them.

Oh, I know we have a vote here. This is the eighth day of the shutdown, and we have, in this House, passed eight bills to appropriate pieces of this government.

These are the 12 appropriation bills. These are the 12 appropriation bills that fund every function of government, whether it's the military, whether it's the farm programs, the day care programs, the health care programs, the Centers for Disease Control. Here they are, more than 1,000 specific items. And in 8 days, our Republican colleagues have put before us eight bills to fund eight of the more than 1,000. At this rate, it will be 2020 before this government fully is functional. How foolish. How stupid. How humiliating for this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let your people vote. Let us vote. Let us vote on reopening this government. The votes

are there. A simple blackboard will tell you the votes are there. Tonight, call us back to session, and tomorrow morning the people of America, the people across this world will see the strongest Nation in the world, the government of that Nation functioning once again.

How do I go back to my district and tell the people at the Dixon National Cemetery that those burials aren't going to take place? How do I go back to my district and tell them—yeah, maybe we ought to see this.

In California, northern California, it's hunting season, opened on Saturday, but the refugees across this great Nation are closed to hunters, the duck hunters, the men and women that want to recreate in those areas. And if you're not a hunter, maybe you're a fisherman, but don't go to a refuge. Don't go to the Bureau of Land Management fishing areas. Don't try to put your boat in the water at the national parks. You can't do it because this government is shut down.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let your people vote. Let us all vote. Let us reopen this government.

We have several of my colleagues with me tonight. We're going to cover this issue. How much I would prefer to be here with my colleagues from New York and other States to talk about putting Americans back to work. And I guess we are, in a way, putting the Federal employees back to work.

Mr. PAUL TONKO from the great State of New York, thanks for joining us once again.

Mr. TONKO. My pleasure. I appreciate the gentleman from California bringing us together tonight in thoughtful discussion about what is chaos here in the Nation's Capitol. So, Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for bringing us together with Representatives from New Jersey and from Connecticut and from Pennsylvania, and others who will probably join us that will speak to the unnecessary pain that has trickled into the lives of far too many working families across this country and impacting so many small businesses from coast to coast with the ill effects of a government shutdown—a Republican government shutdown simply because, as you just heard the gentleman from California indicate, we need to vote on a CR, a continuing resolution, a bill that allows for the budget to continue into a date certain as mentioned in that bill, most likely 2 months—8 weeks—as an extender into perhaps mid-December.

Why do we need to do that? So that we can bring stability into the process, allow government to be funded, allow for the doors to be opened, allow for the lights to go on and reopen government. That's the first step in the sequence.

Secondly, another cornerstone bit of legislation coming quickly upon us, giving the green light to America to pay her bills. America's working families understand what that's about.

They know that they play by the rules. They roll up their sleeves. They work hard. They expect to taste success. They pay their bills on time, and they expect their beloved country to do the same thing. Our second step in the process.

Then thirdly, buying this 8 weeks of time allows us to immediately name those individuals who will be the representatives for the majority and minority parties in each of the Houses of Congress to sit down and nail down a budget in those ensuing 8 weeks to make certain that stability again is the outcome. That's what we're asking for.

Mr. Speaker, you are the Speaker not only to the Tea Party, not only to the Republican Conference, but to the entire House, the United States House of Representatives. Let all of us vote on what is a clean CR, which has been approved by the United States Senate—and, by the way, in negotiations to date, accepts your number, the lowest number in the process. We're not happy with that number, but we're going to cave to your request to allow for government to be refunded, to be reopened, and for us to move forward. That's what it's about.

We're asking for dignity to be expressed for America's working families. We're allowing for certainty to be the outcome for our small business community so that we can grow our economy, allow for the climate that produces both public and private sector job growth that allows us to move forward with a sense of hope. That's what the request is here.

Why don't you let us vote on a clean CR? Are you fearful that it might pass? Are you fearful that you don't get your way? Because you know, in the 45 votes that have been taken on a debt ceiling limit vote since the days of President Ronald Reagan, those 45 measures have been approved 38 times without any bells and whistles—and certainly unprecedented to have attached to the vote some sort of clutter that deals with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Never have we reached to that sort of negotiated outcome where we are repealing the law of the land—in this case, the law of the land that is 3 years old, was approved by a majority in the House of Representatives, was approved by a supermajority in the United States Senate, was tested, because of your concern, before the highest Court of the land, and the Supreme Court gave it thumbs-up in meeting the constitutionality test. What more do we need to do to convince you?

Let me just say this, Representative GARAMENDI, quickly so we can get to our colleagues. I want to share with you some of the results in these few 8 days already—but painful 8 days for far too many.

By the end of this month, food pantries like the one in my district in Cohoes, New York, may not have the money to stay open. That is the situa-

tion with many of our food pantries. This is a facility that helps feed 215 hungry families in the capital region of New York State.

Projections are that one of the providers of electronics for our fighter jets, our submarines, and our helicopters in Saratoga Springs, New York, in the 20th Congressional District that I represent, have grinded to a halt as inspectors can't complete contracts and new orders cannot come in.

We also have impacting us a forensic meteorology business in Niskayuna, New York—again, in the 20th Congressional District of New York—that works each and every day with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, that helps bring benefits to all of us from the devastation of Mother Nature. These are jobs that are meaningful—meaningful to the quality of life of people across this country, that are meaningful to working families who are now without jobs, people who are not getting paid and showing up to work. These are devastating consequences to the economy.

We implore the leadership of this House, we implore the Speaker to call for a vote on a clean continuing resolution that embraces your number, the lowest number in negotiations that we will settle upon. We will offer our votes for that kind of measure, only give us that chance so that America can have her government funded, we can move forward to advance the debt ceiling limit bill vote that will allow for America to pay her bills, and then finally move to that conference table, where representation from both parties in each of the Houses will nail down a budget in the ensuing 8 weeks.

□ 2015

That will bring stability to the economy and will bring economic and social justice to the people of this great country. Let's move forward with that sense of fairness.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO, the gentleman from New York.

I would like now to bring to the microphone our friend from the great State of Connecticut, JOHN LARSON.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from California for organizing this hour, and I appreciate the eloquence of our colleague from New York, both of whom have addressed the most important issue of the day, in fact, the last 8 days, as Mr. GARAMENDI has articulated.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves dealing with the issue “de jure.” Each day the goalposts move, each day the American public sits in utter amazement and disgust with its elective representatives. It is astounding to them to see the greatest Nation in the world brought to its knees.

Our forefathers were very prescient—and certainly George Washington, who Daniel Webster, the Senator from Massachusetts in this Chamber—well, actually, it would have been down the hall—got up on the 100th anniversary

of George Washington's birth and talked about the President's admonitions. Amongst his keenest admonitions was about that of “excessive” party spirit.

Now, in Washington's day, there weren't political parties, as we know them. It wasn't Democrat or Republican; it was Federalist or anti-Federalist. He knew very well and was concerned deeply about what factions could do. He warned about the outside influence of party. But what he was most concerned about is what happens within a government if people in that very government are at war with their own existence, are working against the interest of the government and therefore the people.

So we find ourselves this evening as Members of the minority coming to this floor and asking for one simple thing from the majority, and that is a vote. Now, we understand that we have asked for votes on this floor—we have asked for votes to put the country back to work. As the gentleman from California has articulated on many occasions to come here and talk about making things in America and allowing a vote to put us back to work, we have been denied that opportunity. We have been denied the opportunity here to vote on nutrition and funding and making sure that important bills like the agriculture bill, that the very poor amongst us and the very needy are fed. We have been denied an opportunity to vote on immigration, as you heard CHARLIE RANGEL talk about so nobly earlier this evening. We have also, most importantly, been denied a vote here that is fundamental to our democracy.

The most fundamental thing and the most patriotic thing that we do in a society is vote. Yet here, because of the tyranny of the majority, 200-plus Democrats are not allowed a vote. More importantly, the American people are not allowed a vote on the continuing of its government. As the gentleman from New York pointed out, not only is it the continuation and shutdown of government, but on the near horizon defaulting on the full faith and credit of the American people. This is unconscionable.

But Washington was prescient when a few, dangerously are at war with their own government, who seek to bring that government down, who seek to bring the government down through a shutdown; and then by not paying the bills that this body and the other body have racked up, the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth. We need to be able to express the will of the people. All we ask of the majority party is for a vote, a simple vote, as the gentleman from New York said, on a continuing resolution unencumbered that does nothing more, and at the levels that they have requested, but put the Nation back to work and then respond quickly to the need to pay our debts without being held hostage.

You are not holding Barack Obama hostage, Mr. Speaker. You are not



holding the Democrats in Congress hostage, Mr. Speaker. You are holding the people of the United States hostage. For the sake of fairness and being responsible, bring the bill to the floor for a vote. Allow the minority the opportunity to vote.

If you don't have the votes, let it be so, and let the world know, and let every American citizen know, where their Members stand on this issue. Stand with your country. Do not let it be shut down. Do not let it default. At least give us a vote.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. LARSON.

Mr. Speaker, a vote—that is what democracy is all about. We are asking for a simple thing: the opportunity to vote on extending the operations of the American government.

Now I would like to turn to the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. I thank my colleague from California and my colleagues from New York and Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, many of us that you will see on the floor tonight, we are not regulars, we are not people that come to the floor often to speak. But I think many of us feel it is important for the American people to understand the nature of this task, this battle, that we face on their behalf.

We hear a lot from Republicans about the President not wanting to negotiate, not wanting to talk. The Democrats don't want to negotiate. They have been pretty good at saying that over and over and over again, Mr. Speaker. But what they are not telling the American people is the nature of the negotiation that they want to have. I think it is important that that be revealed.

What makes me so angry—and the reason I am here tonight—is what we face in the country right now is completely a manufactured crisis. There is no structural economic reason that our country should be facing default come the 17th of this month. There is no reason that 800,000 Federal employees aren't working. There is no reason for this to happen.

This is being manufactured by a party because they are trying to get something that they have not been able to get at the ballot box. We have divided government. The Republicans control the House of Representatives, the Senate is controlled by the Democratic party, we have a Democratic President.

The Republicans had two goals going into this manufactured crisis. One was to destroy the health care bill. Now, this is a bill that passed the House of Representatives, it passed the Senate, it was signed by the President, it was upheld by the Supreme Court. We had a Presidential election and their candidate said on day one of his new administration the first thing he would do if elected was to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That gentleman lost by 5 million votes.

What they can't accomplish at the ballot box they now were looking for a way to accomplish here. But it couldn't be done through the regular process, Mr. Speaker. It couldn't be done through the regular order.

So now comes this ingenious idea, hatched by the Tea Party wing of the Republican Party, to say: Here is what we will do. We will wait until the end of the fiscal year to come, and we will say we are going to shut the government down unless you repeal ObamaCare.

I was on this floor a couple of days ago and read something on the floor that I saw on the Internet by a young man by the name of Judd Legum. I hope I have said his last name correctly. He put an analogy about what we were actually facing. He said it is sort of like if someone comes up to you and says, I want to burn down your house, and you look at the guy and you say, no. And he says, well, I just want to burn down the second floor, and you tell him, no. And he goes, well, what about your garage, can I burn your garage down? And you say, no. And the guy says, well, let's just sit down and talk about what part of your house I can burn down, and you look at the guy and you say, no. And he goes, you see, you're not compromising.

This is what we are facing in this so-called "rigged" negotiation. What Republicans are saying is, defund ObamaCare, we will open up the government. We said, no. Then they said, we will delay ObamaCare for a year and we will open up the government, and we said, no. Then they said, well, just get rid of that individual mandate—which effectively kills the health care bill—and we said, no. Then they said, well, will you just sit down and negotiate with us and tell us what part of the Affordable Care Act we can get rid of, and we said, there are 20 million Americans that are counting on this bill, it is the law of the land, the answer is no.

And they look at us and say, the Democrats don't want to negotiate; the President doesn't want to negotiate.

Well, I got news for my friends over there: we are not going to negotiate the rights of 20 million uninsured Americans because they can't get this done at the ballot box.

So now, Mr. Speaker, what is the new strategy? They have shifted off of the health care bill now because the American public, by margins of over 70 percent, have said we don't want you to shut the government down to try to get rid of the Affordable Care Act.

So now where have they moved? To the Ryan budget. What is the Ryan budget? It is a budget that keeps us in sequester, it is a budget that does not invest in our infrastructure, it is a budget that does not invest in the education of our children, it is a budget that makes it impossible for this economy to grow, and it is a budget that threatens the social safety net that many of our senior citizens depend on.

They couldn't get it passed in the regular order. They couldn't get it passed in their own House of Representatives for a long time. They were afraid to put the bill on the floor. They certainly couldn't get it passed in the Senate, and they knew the President wouldn't sign it.

So what is the strategy now? This new rigged negotiation that we are being asked to have with our friends is: Give us pieces of the Ryan budget, and in return we will open up the government and we will raise the debt ceiling, but only if you give us what we want in the Ryan budget.

Mr. Speaker, we want to have a budget negotiation with our friends on the Republican side. The House has passed a budget, the Senate has passed a budget. The numbers—there is a great disparity in the numbers. Democrats believe in investing in America. We want to rebuild our roads and bridges and sewer systems. We want to invest in the education of our children. We want to protect our seniors and our veterans. It costs money to do that, Mr. Speaker, so there is a difference.

But we are ready and we are willing to appoint conferees tomorrow to sit down and have a negotiation. I want the American public to understand that we have asked 18 times to appoint conferees to negotiate the differences in the Senate budget and the House budget, and all 18 times the Republicans in the House have said no.

□ 2030

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just say if there's someone in this House that's not willing to negotiate, it's our friends on the Republican side of the aisle. The American people deserve a budget negotiation where we sit down and settle our differences. We're not going to get everything we want, Mr. Speaker; it's divided government. The Republicans are going to get something in this budget negotiation, the Democrats are going to get something in the budget negotiation. But the country moves forward, we pay our bills, and we live to pay another day.

In closing, let me say to the American people, we will not be part of a rigged negotiation where Democratic priorities and principles aren't allowed to be discussed, only that which the Republicans couldn't get in the ballot box that they're trying to get now by holding a gun to our head. That's not how you do business in the United States of America. That kind of behavior has to be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of the American people, I hope Republicans will come to their senses, pass a clean CR, and let's sit down and negotiate a budget agreement for the American people and move this country forward.

I thank you for yielding me this time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. DOYLE, thank you so very much. The Republican shutdown has to end. It has to end, and how correct you were about the negotiations just this evening. They put a

proposal on the floor to create some sort of a negotiating committee that did not have all of the issues before them, as you so correctly pointed out, only their set of issues were to be allowed to be discussed by that negotiating committee, none of the issues that we care about on the Democratic side. That's hardly a negotiating opportunity.

I now yield to the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GARAMENDI for bringing us all together tonight. I couldn't stand with better Americans than I am standing with tonight. I mean that.

Mr. Speaker, the latest supercommittee plan that folks on the other side of the aisle gave us today is really absurd. In fact, as a member of the Budget Committee, this new-found Republican insistence on negotiations, referred to by Mr. DOYLE from Pennsylvania, is mind boggling, since my colleagues have spent the last 6 months avoiding negotiations. And I didn't come here tonight to water the wine, so we're going to say it like it is.

My fellow Americans, this House of Representatives passed its budget over 200 days ago on March 21. Then the Senate passed its budget 2 days later. Now, think about what I just said. What happened to it? Well, the usual protocol is the two sides name conferees, they come together in conference, and they work out a budget. That didn't happen. That's 6 months ago. We've been asking to go to conference so we can resolve our differences, and there are always differences within parties, between parties, you name it. We want to fund the government. We want to get rid of sequestration, like Chairman ROGERS said on July 31, 2013:

I believe the House has made its choice. Sequestration—and its unrealistic, ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

Mr. ROGERS is the chairman, a Republican, he said it. He said that; I didn't say that. He said it better than I could ever imagine saying it.

So what happened? Democrats attempted to go to conference 20 times. The Republicans objected every single time. Fact check this: over here in the House, we have almost 200 Members who signed the discharge petition calling for a conference on the budget. We tried four times to bring the resolution to the floor. Leader PELOSI even went so far as to name conferees. Some of them are in this room. Some of us are conferees. She did that on June 27. What's the date today—October 8? June 27. So why, after this stalling, have the Republicans finally found religion and now they want to negotiate?

I'll tell you why: we've just discovered we have a phantom government in the United States. Every Congressman, every House Member, every Senate Member should be concerned that they're elected by the people of this

country, be they Democrat, Republican, Independent, Libertarian, it doesn't matter, they've been elected. They stood for election. We respect that, regardless of denomination, because we know that neither party is ever perfect. Come on, we all share in the pluses, we share in the minuses. There's never one party that has all of the answers. We know that. But why?

Well, just this past Saturday, October 5, we had a front page story in The New York Times. It was mind boggling—mind boggling—that article. Here's the title of that article, "The Federal budget crisis months in planning." Well, I don't remember planning this. I don't know if any Republicans were out planning this. Who in God's name are they talking about? And this is what it says in the article in the second paragraph, which refers to a manifesto—a manifesto—put together by non-elected people in this country. Hear me, America, hear me.

They sat down one morning in a location the members insist on keeping secret. Wow. And came—little noticed—a blueprint. This is what they said, Mr. Speaker. A blueprint to defunding ObamaCare signed by—oh, you're going to love this, Ed Meese. Boy there's a name that pops up. I can't believe it. Ed Meese. It's not funny, it's serious; a phantom government. Leaders of more than three-dozen conservative groups, and I will put in the RECORD tonight who those groups are, and I got part of their manifesto. Listen to this. This is what they put together. And I'm sure there are only a few Congressmen on the other side who even knew about this. It says this:

Conservatives should not approve a CR unless it defunds ObamaCare. This includes ObamaCare's unworkable exchanges, unsustainable Medicaid expansion, and attack on life and religious liberty.

They said that February 14, 2013. This did not just happen, Mr. Speaker. It didn't just happen. It wasn't an accident; it was planned. That is the lowest thing you could ever read about a government that wasn't even elected. Who the heck are these people to decide what we're going to do?

Now we know why Mr. RYAN did not want to go to conference. Now we know why Mr. BOEHNER did not want to go to conference, because that was not the plan. Read it. Judge for yourself. Judge for yourself.

It also said that these 30 groups, and the names of each group besides Mr. Meese's, are right here. You've got every right-wing group in the universe. They go into this manifesto on Medicaid expansion, permanent appropriations, implementation. They want to run the government. These people actually wanted to run the government.

My friends, the Republicans don't want to negotiate. They want to use this shutdown and the threat of default to invalidate the results of—oh, an election last November. These people weren't elected, we were elected. And I love debating people from the other

side who are elected. That's their God-given right. That's what liberty is all right. Why don't they come in here, this shadow government, this phantom group, why don't they stand there and tell us who they talked to within the Republican Party. Tell us. America has a right to know.

Don't you talk to me, Mr. Speaker, about let's have transparency in government when you have this vagabond group out here funded by—guess. I'll give you three guesses. No, I'll only give you one guess: the Koch brothers. They think they're running this government. The Supreme Court heard another case today—isn't that interesting. This is mild compared to what would happen if they were able to do and spend as much money as they want.

I did not come here to water the wine. You better listen to it, and every member of the staff better listen because they tried every trick in the book, putting your own health care in jeopardy, saying that you get a subsidy from the government when it's just like any company that in some way contributes to your health care. Somebody gets hired by the Federal Government to be a secretary, making \$20,000, \$25,000 a year, the cost of their health care will go up between \$5,200 and \$12,000. How are you going to live on that being a staff member here on the floor or back in your districts. They will stop at nothing, nothing, to bring the government down at any cost. At any cost.

The November election apparently did not occur in their minds. We are dealing with dangerous people. Either they are on hallucinogenic drugs or they just lost their minds. This is what we're dealing with. To bring us to this precipice only a few days away, something's wrong. This is not how we debate things in the United States of America. This is not in any manner, shape, or form. As President Obama said, Democrats are willing to negotiate, but not with a gun to our heads. Never. I'm from Paterson, New Jersey; you never put a gun to my head, I've got news for you.

Let's end this irresponsible shutdown and default threat, and let's get back to work. That's what we were sent here for.

I thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI for your patience.

Signed:

Edwin Meese III, Former Attorney General, President Ronald Reagan; Chris Chocola, President, Club for Growth; Jenny Beth Martin, Co-Founder, Tea Party Patriots; Penny Nance, President, Concerned Women for America; The Honorable J. Kenneth Blackwell, President, Constitutional Congress, Inc.; William Wilson, President, Americans for Limited Government; Duane Parde, President, National Taxpayers Union; Susan Carleson, President, American Civil Rights Union; Andrea Lafferty, President, Traditional Values Coalition; Alfred S. Regnery, President, The Paul Revere Project; Lewis Uhler, President, National Tax Limitation Committee; Brent Bozell, President, ForAmerica; Matt Kibbe, President, FreedomWorks; Marjorie Dannenfelser,

President, Susan B. Anthony List; David Williams, President, Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

The Honorable David McIntosh, Former U.S. Representative, Indiana; David Bozell, Executive Director, ForAmerica; Colin Hanna, President, Let Freedom Ring; Stuart Epperson, President, Council for National Policy; Heather Higgins, President, Independent Women's Forum; Cindy Chafian, President, The Mommy Lobby; Gary Bauer, President, American Values; Mike Needham, CEO, Heritage Action for America; David Bossie, President, Citizens United; Mathew D. Staver, Chairman, Liberty Counsel Action; James Martin, Chairman, 60 Plus Association; Erick Erickson, Editor, RedState.com; T. Kenneth Cribb, Former Domestic Advisor, President Ronald Reagan; Becky Norton Dunlop, Former White House Advisor, President Ronald Reagan; Grace-Marie Turner, President, The Galen Institute.

Myron Ebell, President, Freedom Action; Craig Shirley, Reagan Campaign Biographer; Rev. Lou Sheldon, Chairman, Traditional Values Coalition; Richard Rahn, President, Inst. for Global Economic Growth; Lee Beaman, Businessman, Nashville, TN; Bob Reccord, Executive Director, Council for National Policy; Angelo M. Codevilla, Professor, Emeritus, Boston University; Tom Donelson, Chairman, America's PAC; Brian Baker, President, Ending Spending; Kay R. Daly, President, Coalition for a Fair Judiciary; Don Devine, Senior Scholar, The Fund for American Studies; Gary Aldrich, President, Patrick Henry Center for Individual Liberty; Ralph Benko, President, Center for Civic Virtue; Andresen Blom, Senior Strategist, Center for Civic Virtue; Joe Gregory, CEO, Gregory Management Co.; Rebecca Hagelin.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. PASCRELL, thank you very much. Whether you're from New Jersey or wherever, I'm not about to threaten you. But I would like to welcome to this microphone our friend from the State of Massachusetts, who is probably just as tough as the gentleman from New Jersey, and that's Mr. CAPUANO.

Mr. CAPUANO. For the first time in my life, I have no intention of being as passionate as the gentleman from New Jersey, and I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I was going to walk people through this because to me, good people can disagree. Reasonable people can disagree. Even people I disagree with vehemently, that's what politics, that's what government, that's what life is all about. But you're not entitled to forget history or to ignore facts. And for me, there have been lots of misrepresentations in the last week or two because there's a lot of passion, a lot of emotion. But I need to back up a little bit, educational value.

When I'm told that the Democrats have to come to the table and compromise, my answer is: We have, repeatedly. And we will do it again, if necessary.

And people say, Well, no, you haven't. The President is saying no, you won't negotiate.

Well, no, we won't negotiate on this issue at this point in time because we have already gone far enough, and here's why. 2011, the last supercommittee, where did it come from? It

came from the budget impasse. We couldn't come to an agreement. We couldn't make a deal. We had taken our corners. What did we do? We created a supercommittee and it was said if the supercommittee doesn't work, do something like Simpson-Bowles or whatever they would come up with, then we would institute a sequester. And a sequester, for all intents and purposes, is an across-the-board cut of roughly 8 percent per year every year for 10 years in a row. That's what it is. At the end of that 10th year if you don't do anything, you would be spending approximately 48 cents of every dollar you were spending when you started.

Now I understand that some people want a government that does that and the programs that would pay for. I don't agree with that, but that's a reasonable position to take. "I don't want senior housing. I don't want childhood nutrition." I don't agree with it, but it's a reasonable position to take, and we should argue about that and we should debate about that, and the American people should have an opportunity to elect people that agree or disagree with them on those types of issues.

□ 2045

We couldn't come to an agreement, so the sequester took place; and the sequester set out numbers each year for 10 years. This is as much as you can spend unless you come up with some sort of agreement to get around it. We haven't been able to do it. We've had the first year of sequester and are about to enter the second year of sequester.

Pursuant to the law that was passed in 2011, a law, by the way, I voted against—I don't like the concept of sequester—but the majority ruled and it passed. Pursuant to that law in this coming fiscal year, we would have been allowed to spend a little over a trillion dollars. Remember, that number is based on an 8 percent cut from the prior year. So this already represents a cut, and, by the way, it represents a massive compromise between Democrats and Republicans to pass that sequester. So it was a Democratic compromise with Republicans to cut the budget for 10 years in a row. That's where we start.

This year, Republicans passed a budget of \$967 billion, \$100 billion below what the sequester allows. They're entitled to do that. Again, I can disagree, but I respect their viewpoint. If you really think the government can operate and provide the services the American people want on that number, fine. I will disagree, we will vote, pass it, and we'll move on. Of course, the Senate didn't agree with that number. The Senate passed another number. Here we are today.

What's happened? The last week or so, you have heard pretty much every Democrat, pretty much every Democrat say we want to vote on the clean

CR, the continuing resolution, that the Senate passed. The average American has no clue what we're talking about. Here's what they passed. They passed a budget that would allow the spending of \$986 billion. To me, if you're going to talk about a compromise—sequester allows a little over a trillion. Republicans want \$967 billion. The compromise is here, a little over a trillion dollars. That would be a compromise on a compromise. But, no, the Senate says not \$986 billion. That's a compromise on a compromise on a compromise. What did the Republican House leaders say? No. \$967 billion, our number. By the way, no health care.

For those of you who thought Democrats haven't been compromising, I'm here to tell you, in my opinion, not only have we compromised; I think we have compromised too much from my philosophical viewpoint. I know that I'm the minority view in this House. So be it. I think the sequester was too much. I certainly think \$967 billion is too much, and I think \$986 billion is too much. You know why? My constituents want senior housing, they want children fed, they want young people educated, and on and on and on. They want veterans benefits. They want all the things that we do. Of course no one wants to pay for that. I get that. I don't either. I pay taxes. I wish everything was free. I'm going out to dinner in a little while, hopefully to watch the Red Sox win the series, and I don't want to pay for dinner, but I guess I'll have to.

Reasonable differences of opinion, no matter how dramatic they may be, a \$100 billion difference, are realistic, they're honest, and the American people have a right to take sides. They don't have a right to say Democrats haven't compromised. This was a compromise. This would have been a compromise. This is a compromise. This is not. This is uncompromising. That's why I wanted to come up here.

By the way, there's one little point of historic note. I've been in the House 14½ years. This is my first Special Order. And, as I said, I probably missed the first inning of the Red Sox game, which in my district is close to a cardinal sin. But this is more important.

I'm not trying to convince anyone that my side is right or the other side is wrong. People have their opinions. I know that. You're probably not going to change them. I am here to say that there is a difference between compromise and capitulation. We have compromised one, two, three times to get where we are. To get to this number would be the fourth. To get rid of health care would be fifth; and not just fifth, it would be the ending. As far as I'm concerned, this Democrat will not compromise further on these issues. It's time for the other side to compromise off of what they think the world should be.

Thank you for yielding, Mr. GARAMENDI.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. CAPUANO, thank you so very much. I think it's a

tragedy you've waited 14½ years to be so eloquent in explaining how we got to where we are and the fact that the Democrats have consistently cooperated, compromised, and watched those critical programs that we care so very much about being consistently hacked away at and reduced and, in many cases, all but eliminated.

Now, we are in the eighth day of the shutdown of the United States Government that used to be thought of as the most powerful democracy in the world. At the moment, it's a democracy that's not working. As pointed out by my colleagues, there was an election last November in which these issues were all fundamental in that debate, and the American people voted to fully enforce the Affordable Care Act and to provide the services, whether they're education, transportation, health care, and the rest. Here we are, the minority party in this House and actually a minority of that minority party, driving an agenda that is anathema to those things that I believe we need to do and completely contrary to last November's election.

I would like now to call upon Mr. RYAN of Ohio, a gentleman who often joins us on these evening discussions. We'd like to talk about jobs, and we'd like to talk about rebuilding the American manufacturing sector. We know that can only be done when the United States Government is operating.

I yield to Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate my colleagues' words here tonight. There's not a whole lot left to cover, whether it was the gentleman from Pittsburgh or the gentleman from Paterson or the gentleman from East Hartford or the gentleman from Somerville in the Boston area, and also the gentleman from upstate New York. We've seen them cover many of the issues here. They've been broken down. I would just like to maybe touch on a point or two.

A lot of Members have come to this floor. On all the TV shows they talk a lot about, We've got to pay our bills, we've got to pay our bills. I think everybody here agrees that we've got to pay our bills. It's important for us to remember the bills that were racked up that we have to go out and pay, those appropriation bills, off-budget many times, were to fund two wars. They went right on Uncle Sam's credit card, both of them. They were not paid for, and many of our colleagues on the other side never came to this floor and said, Oh my, God, how are we going to pay for all of this?

Economist after economist would come back and say this is going to be maybe \$100 billion, \$200 billion, \$300 billion, \$400 billion, \$500 billion today. If we factor in all the veterans that are coming back, these wars are going to be \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion to \$4 trillion when it's all said and done. I don't remember being here watching a Member come up on the other side of the aisle, get in the well, and make an argument

that we need to pay for these wars if we are going to go. There was not one.

Today, they want to talk about being responsible. They want to talk about us meeting our obligation. Now they want to say, Oh, yeah, we ran up those credit cards. We swiped them, and we kept swiping them. Then we doubled down. We need a surge. Let's double down. Let's run that credit card one more time. Now today they're saying, We're not going to pay the bills. We're going to default unless you repeal the Affordable Care Act, and then we'll have a conversation.

It's the height of irresponsibility.

Another thing that I find humorous is how over the past few years we've been lectured to by many members of the Tea Party about the Constitution of the United States and how they're the only Americans, this 20 percent, 25 percent, maybe 30 percent, are the only Americans who have read the Constitution, and they're the only ones who adhere to the Constitution. Yet when we talk about the political process that we need to work through, and as Mr. CAPUANO was just saying, you can have a reasonable position. If you don't like it, go to the ballot box and win the election. Yet those very same Members are now thumbing their noses at the political process that the Founding Fathers set up for us to adhere to.

We were here during the Iraq war. I was. I wasn't for it. I campaigned against it in my first campaign. Guess what? I didn't win. I didn't win the argument in 2002 and 2003. I didn't win it in 2004 or 2005. I came to this floor night after night after night. We finally won the House and Senate in 2006. We tried to stop the war. We didn't do it, but we took it to the people and we won the House and the Senate back. In 2007 and 2008, we took it back to the street, won the Presidency. Then, longer than any of us wanted, we finally started winding things down. We went through the political process. We didn't shut the government down. We didn't say we're going to default on the credit card bills that previous Congresses ran up, even though we disagreed with how they spent the money.

What's happening is radical. These are radical acts here in the House Chamber. To say we are here to negotiate, if you get rid of the Affordable Care Act, is ludicrous. It doesn't make any sense. Have the guts to go to the American people and make the argument. For the life of me, I can't figure out why you wouldn't let the Affordable Care Act get set up. If it's so awful, if it's so bad, set it up, and let it go. President Obama has his fingerprints all over it. The Democrats have their fingerprints all over it. If it fails, you'll win the Senate in 2014; and if it's so bad, you'll win the Presidency in 2016. You can then defund it, dismantle it, and put 30 million or 40 million people out of the health care system, make sure you can get denied health care for having a pre-existing condition and put the insurance companies be-

tween the doctor and the patient. Fine, you won the elections. You're perfectly capable of doing that.

Have the guts to go to the street and make the argument. Seventy percent of Americans are saying do not shut the government down to try to end the Affordable Care Act.

I will say what I think's happening here. I think the House leadership on the Republican side has Stockholm syndrome. I think they have started to identify themselves with their captors. The Tea Party has now convinced the leadership in the House of Representatives that they should have sympathy and empathy towards their captors, so the whole country at this point is being shut down because of this.

Lastly, let me say that the only successful moments in politics that our friends on the other side have had is when they divide the American people. Who's in a union; who's not in a union. Who's in a public sector union versus who's in a private sector union. Who's black; who's white. Who's gay; who's straight. Divide, divide, divide, divide; and here we are in 2013 a divided Nation that is ungovernable at this point because of the power that is held by the Tea Party in the United States House of Representatives.

I just want to say that there is a future waiting to be taken for this country, investments back in the United States into our infrastructure, into our research, into renewable energies, into expanding the grid and making it smarter, and into making sure everyone has access to the latest technologies such as three dimensional printers in schools, robotics, Legos. Get kids excited about learning.

We only have 313 million people in the United States. We're competing against 1.4 billion people in China, and we're sitting on our hands. We're not making the investments we need to be making, and there are colleges and universities and schools that need the investment. Every day that goes by, Mr. GARAMENDI, we see one more, two more, five more, 10 more situations where investments were made collectively by the public to benefit our country.

We need to end this lockout that's happening right now.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

□ 2100

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RYAN, thank you so much for bringing us just some sense of reality of what is actually happening here.

We're in the eighth day of the lockout. We're in the eighth day of the shutdown of the government of the United States of America. And it appears, from all that we hear from the Republican side, that this may go right up to the debt limit. What a tragedy it would be if we hit that and took down the entire economy.

I think it's time for me to close. I want to thank my colleagues. I would

ask the American people to pay attention.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, let us vote. Speaker BOEHNER, let us vote on a clean continuing resolution so that we can, once again, start this government. The votes are here. And if you don't believe the votes are here, put us up on the board. Let's see if there are 217 votes to reopen the American Government. We can only find out, Mr. Speaker, if you let us vote.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying that I am exceptionally privileged to be here on the House floor of the United States Congress this evening to speak on behalf of my constituents and in front of the Nation. It is an honor that few people realize, and it's worthy of mention.

I just want to also thank the fine gentlemen and ladies from the other side that were here this evening. I appreciate your impassioned pleas. That's what this place is all about. I might disagree with many of them, but I appreciate your passion and your willingness to serve.

I just want to talk about a couple of things and, at least from my side, Mr. Speaker, set the record, or at least kind of balance the record—maybe not set it straight in some people's minds because I'm sure some folks will disagree. But when the one gentleman said that he opposed the Iraq war and folks were here paying for it with a credit card and he was opposed to that, well, I wasn't here. So I can't really atone for the sins of the past, and there's a good chance that I would disagree with many of them, but one of the reasons I wasn't here was because I was in Iraq at that time.

And even though I think it is morally wrong to have spent this Nation into such debt over those conflicts, when you are attacked, you must respond, number one; and, number two, I think it kind of belies the fact that the current administration has nearly doubled that spending in half the time. So with all due respect, I think it's fair just to point that out.

And regarding another gentleman who talked about the interest of the other side to negotiate and agree to a compromise and to compromise, in looking at the numbers, the sequester came from the President of the United States out of another supercommittee that was created, and the President demanded the sequester, demanded the number. So this Congress has given it to him, and this Congress has held that number. It was demanded out of that negotiation. So by saying that they've

compromised, they haven't compromised on anything. That's where we all agreed to be at the end of that negotiation.

Now, there's been a lot of impassioned talk and yelling and wailing, and I don't really think that's helpful to the narrative here. We're all going to have to work together at some point and figure this thing out, and blaming one side or the other side, I just don't know where that really gets us.

I want to just talk a little bit about some of the facts. And these aren't my facts; they're not SCOTT PERRY's facts. I've got The Washington Post here, because some people say this is unprecedented, it's never happened before, and only one party does this.

Well, there was a shutdown in 1976. Gerald Ford was the President. The Democrats held both Houses. It was ended by all sides coming together and working towards a continuing resolution.

The next one was in 1977. Jimmy Carter was the President. Democrats held both Houses. Amazingly, it was resolved by both sides coming together and working on a Medicaid ban.

Then there was the shutdown of 1977. Jimmy Carter was the President. Democrats were in charge of both Houses. They signed a temporary bill because they came together and worked something out. The 1977 shutdown under Jimmy Carter, Democrats were in charge, and they were doing what they thought they needed to do. They're elected by their people to do the work of this House, but they came together after 8 days and they resolved it.

The next one, 1978. Jimmy Carter was the President. The Democrats controlled both Houses. Eighteen days—eighteen days—but they resolved it after they got together. The President, the Senate, and the House, they got together.

1979, Jimmy Carter was the President. The Democrats were in charge of both Houses. Eleven days. What resolved it? They got together and they talked. Nothing happens here, and nothing will happen here, if we're not going to be willing to be civil with one another and get together and talk.

1981, Ronald Reagan was the President. The Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by the Democrats. After 2 days, they resolved it. Again, Reagan came down and signed a bill extending the current spending limit.

And then again, in September of '82, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans held the Senate. Democrats held the House. Tip O'Neill was the Speaker. But they resolved it in just 1 day because they got together. Both of them were out that evening having fundraisers, both parties. They let the government shut down, but they got together and moved beyond it.

1982, Tip O'Neill again the Speaker. Republicans were in charge of the Senate. Ronald Reagan was President.

Over the MX missile, they shut it down, but they figured out a way to get past it because they negotiated.

And for 3 days in 1983, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans were in charge of the Senate. The House was controlled by Democrats, with Tip O'Neill Speaker. And they resolved it, again, over about a \$100 million discrepancy.

1984, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by the Democrats. Over a Supreme Court ruling, they shut it down, but they resolved it after all sides came together and negotiated.

This is from not a right-wing paper in town here. These are not my facts.

1984, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by Democrats. Tip O'Neill was the Speaker. And they shut it down again, but they opened it back up.

The 13th one happened in 1986 under President Reagan. Republicans controlled the Senate, Bob Dole. Democrats in the House by Tip O'Neill. And they resolved it by getting together—each side gave up some of their demands—and they expanded welfare in return for the appropriations necessary to reopen the government.

Ronald Reagan, in 1987, was the President. Democrats were in control of both Houses. And again, they found a way to get together on the fairness doctrine.

In 1990, George H.W. Bush was the President. Democrats controlled both Houses. They figured it out and signed a continuing resolution and reduced the deficit.

And then the 16th time, Clinton was the President and Gingrich was the Speaker of the House. The Senate was controlled by Republicans and so was the House. But even then, they worked it out. Even then, they worked it out. When both Houses of Congress were against the President, Mr. Speaker, they found a way to work it out.

And then for 21 days in 1995, with Clinton as the President and the House was controlled by Republicans and the Senate was controlled by Republicans, again, what resolved it? They worked it out. They got together, and they worked it out.

So let's go to the debt limit, because we've also heard this is a historic time, it's unprecedented, it's never happened before, Mr. Speaker.

So 1970 is where we found out the practice of attaching nongermane provisions to the debt limit began in earnest. In 1971, Social Security changes; 1972, the spending cap and impoundment of powers on the proposal to increase the debt limit.

And I'm just skipping because there's a pile of them here.

In 1980, Congress repealed an oil import fee. President Carter vetoed the bill. Both Houses of Congress were Democrat and President Carter was a Democrat. But he vetoed it, and they

overrode the veto by wide majorities, but they worked it out. They worked it out.

1985, 1990, 1993, 1996, 1997, 2010, 2011, 2012. The debt limit is the appropriate place in this divided government to find some fiscal sanity, and that's what's happening here right now in this town.

Now, of course, like I said, I don't want to get into the blame game here. I'm really going to try to stay out of it. Whether we agree with ObamaCare or not is not the issue. It might be a great law. And there are other laws that some people think are great laws or are not great laws. The question really should be and really is: Can we afford it? Can we afford it?

We are running a trillion-dollar deficit every single year. We take in \$1 trillion less than we spend. So if you are a household that brings in \$100,000, you are spending \$25,000 more every single year as a ratio more than you bring in. I ask the American people, Mr. Speaker, how long can this be sustained?

So even if we agree that it's a good law—and many of us don't. That's fair. But even if we agree that it's a good law, how are we going to pay for it? That's the question.

Now Congress' job in this House and this Senate is to craft legislation and to determine our spending priorities and our spending levels. That's our job. The other gentleman said, We haven't read the Constitution or—it's in the Constitution. It's very simple. That is our job.

With all due respect to the President, I've got to tell you, it does not help. Again, we are going to have to work together. It's for the sake of our Nation. It does not help to be lectured to about what we must do here, according to the President, when it's exactly what he would not do and did not do when he served in this building. It does not help.

Now, our constituents elected us. The citizens of our districts elected us. They elected us to come here and do something, to do something. And we keep on hearing from the other side, Just pass a clean CR. Just pass it and everything will be fine.

I came here to do something. We are spending \$1 trillion more than we bring in every single year. We are \$17 trillion in debt. The bill that's being implemented, the law that's being implemented right now is going to cost us \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion. We don't know. And the President, I understand—I'm not sure of the number—is going to ask in a week to raise the debt ceiling another \$900 billion. So that is \$100 billion short of \$1 trillion, which are still all numbers that are staggering to my mind.

So if we add that up, okay, so at the minimum, we're at \$20 trillion, and that doesn't include Social Security and all the other obligations that we have. And the clean CR that we're being beseeched to just vote on so ev-

everything will be fine says, That's okay, just keep going. Don't change a thing. Everything's fine. Nothing to see here.

Everything's not fine. The constituents that elected me had three concerns when I ran, and I hear about them every single day at the grocery store, at the gas station, on my telephones, in email, and in the letters they send to me. Do something about this debt. Do something about this deficit. Do something about this spending. Do something about ObamaCare. That's what they send to me. That's what they tell me.

Maybe the world doesn't understand where this is going to end, but a lot of us do. When our dollar isn't worth anything, when we have to take a wheelbarrow of dollars to the grocery store to buy just what we need to survive, that's where it will end. We don't have to go there. We are choosing to go there. And it doesn't have to be that way.

Another one of the gentlemen said, Well, we need to move on so we can make investments, investments in education, investments in infrastructure. And he's right. The world is leaving us behind. He's right. But we only have so much money. So we have to prioritize, Mr. Speaker. We must prioritize. And that's what this is about. We said, We've only got so much; and if you want to spend a bunch more on education and on infrastructure so we can compete, then you are not going to have as much money to spend on some other things.

□ 2115

But nobody wants to make that distinction. Nobody wants to choose in this place.

Some of us, reluctantly, because it's unpleasant, but reluctantly we know it is your duty and so we are forced to choose, and we are ready to choose. I say it's doing nothing because passing a clean CR will do nothing to fix our \$17 trillion debt and our \$1 trillion annual deficits. It will do nothing.

So I will go home to my constituents, to the people that elected me, and they'll say, What did you get accomplished? And I will say nothing?

I won't say nothing. No, I will say I tried. I might fail. I might fail, but I'm not going down on my knees, Mr. Speaker. I'm going down, if I go down, I'll go down fighting, because I can't do nothing.

I don't want to see a government shutdown. Nobody in this place wants to see it. It's not good for this side, it's not good for that side, it's not good for the American people. It is not good. We acknowledge that.

But why should anyone believe the concerns about debt and deficit will be discussed when they haven't been discussed in the 5 years?

And to be clear and to be honest, they haven't been discussed really ever. Republicans, Democrats, nobody wants to touch it.

I've got a mother on Social Security, Medicare. I don't want to see her out

on the street. I will take care of my mother. That's what we do in our family. We will not let that happen.

But some people don't have that option. I don't want to see it go bankrupt. But right now, Social Security Disability, that portion of Social Security, the last report I saw, will be bankrupt in a year and a half. In a year and a half.

Social Security, 10, 15 years behind it. Medicare, Medicaid, bankrupting our Nation. And we're doing nothing. We're doing nothing.

We can't do nothing. And so we must discuss it. We must get to the issue.

So we can't agree to this thing where the other side says, just pass it. Let us spend as much as we want to, and we promise you that we'll come to the negotiation table and talk to you about the things that are important to you.

With all due respect, they haven't been important enough in the last 5 years or the last 20 years; and so we have no reason to believe, I have no reason to believe that they will.

And those who say that one side is doing this for partisan reasons, for political gain, I ask, what political gain?

What is the upside?

What is the upside for me, any of us?

There is none. The Representatives in this body who disagree with passing a clean CR are putting themselves at peril for love of country and love of the future.

I've got two little girls, two little girls that I'm desperate to have the same opportunities that I had. When I grew up, our house didn't have electricity. We didn't have running water. My parents were often unemployed. Me and my brother ate some strange things just to eat because we didn't know any better. We did okay. And we made a life for ourselves, but we had an opportunity in America.

But that opportunity is going to slip away from us because of the way we are handling our fiscal house.

Look at what will happen if we continue without adjusting course. I would argue that the first people that would lose their jobs under this situation are government workers.

When we can no longer borrow from the Chinese, when we can no longer borrow from ourselves, Social Security, the Social Security trust fund, part of that \$900 billion that they're going to ask us to raise the debt ceiling so we continue to borrow is coming out of the Social Security trust fund. Who agrees with that?

I don't know one American that says that's okay. And somehow this is the only place in the world where it would be okay.

But government employees, just like in Greece, when they ran out of money, when they ran out finally, the first ones to go—not for a week, not for a couple of days, gone. The job is gone. You are no longer working. You have no job. There's nothing to come back to.

We don't have to do it. We don't have to. We can make a choice now. We're



saying turn the ship around on a dime. We're saying turn the wheel a little bit, just a little bit, and let's start heading to the course of correction.

But voting for a clean CR says just keep going, just keep going. Don't worry about the torpedos, don't worry about the iceberg, just keep going.

So just like in Cyprus, we'll come home to find out the banks under Federal control and Federal order will have removed the money from our savings account. They'll just do it. That's what they did in that country because they ended up where we're going.

Why would we do it?

Now, those who say they want a clean CR, they are patriots. I know that. They are hearing from their constituents. I've had constituents come in, crying, literally crying in my office, and we talked about the situation.

Those folks that want a vote on a clean CR, they are patriots too. They want to fix it; they just want to do it now.

But I would say that it is time to do the hard right because for too long the easy wrong has been done. I don't know when they want to do something, but I want to do it now because I don't think we can wait.

Now, we have offered our ideas and we have asked for their ideas. We have offered them. We understand and respect the other side disagrees with our solution.

We had four votes in this House before this government shut down, four bipartisan votes. People on both sides of the aisle voted four times for something.

But the Senate disagrees. The President disagrees. I respect they disagree. I respect that they don't like our solution. It is their prerogative, and maybe it's their duty.

All we're saying is okay, fine. You disagree. I get it.

What's your idea?

What's your solution?

The solution should not be nothing. The solution from them has been no. Now go about your business and come up with what we want.

It just seems like not negotiating—if I had a fight with my wife, if I had a dispute with my daughter, I never want to go to bed angry at my family, and I never want my family to go to bed angry with me. Before the day's done, we're going to sit down at the table, and we're going to talk about it.

We might go to bed a little sore with each other, but we love each other and we love this country, and so it's imperative that we stay with each other to work through it.

We understand and respect the other side. We understand that they don't want to do anything with ObamaCare, but ObamaCare adds \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion to our national debt. So if you don't want to do anything about that, fine. What do you want to do?

That's all I'm asking. That's all we're asking. What do you want to do?

Some say, well, you need to raise taxes. ObamaCare raised taxes; I think

it was the largest tax increase in history.

Okay. So we did that. And that wasn't enough, so just last December, when I wasn't here, another \$650 billion in taxes on an economy that's struggling to get through, 1 to 2 percent growth.

We're choosing this, and I don't think we have to.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that we're taking in more tax revenue right now, right now, than ever before in history?

There's more money coming in now than ever before, and we're \$1 trillion apart every year. I mean, how much more can we take?

Should we just take it all?

I mean, that's another form of government. It's been done. It doesn't work out real well.

Well, some will say, well, cut the military. Well, this place cut the military about \$1.2 trillion over the last year and a half. And for me, the Constitution says provide, it uses that word, provide for the common defense, Mr. Speaker.

The line below it is promote the general welfare. Words mean things. We have a duty to provide for it.

Certainly, there are inefficiencies. I've been in the military. I've served, and I know they're there. And it's right to take a look. Everything needs to be on the table.

But how much more, and how much do we enfeeble ourselves and disable our ability to do our constitutional requirement, which is to protect the citizenry?

It is our requirement.

Now, we passed a bunch of bills in the House here; and, to tell the you truth, I kind of like it. We're moving towards the CR one piece at a time, so I don't have to vote for things that I don't think we should spend money on for the sake of the things that we must spend money on.

Mr. Speaker, it's not optimal, but it's a way to get there. But, like, for cancer research for kids, we passed that out of the House, and the leader of the Senate says, when asked, well, why won't you pass it? He says, well, why would we want to do that?

My goodness, why wouldn't we want to do that?

That's where we have consensus. We have some consensus.

And another gentleman questioned why Congress has the right to pick and choose what gets funded. Isn't it astounding that someone in the Senate doesn't understand that not only is it the right of Congress to do that, but it's our duty. That's what we're here to do. That's what we're supposed to do.

We have offered numerous ideas. The Senate says no. They don't say no—but. They just say no.

Refusing to negotiate is, to my mind, irresponsible. I mean, I don't know if they're here for themselves or the greater good of Nation when I hear reports—I don't know if they're true—but

they're reported in the newspapers that the park rangers are told make it as difficult as possible.

And when I see the World War II Memorial, when I went out on the Mall this morning, the World War II Memorial barricaded up. It costs more money to close it than it does to leave it open.

I saw a cone out on one the streets with barricades all around the cone in the middle of the street. I mean, why are we renting barricades?

And on the Mall adjacent to the street that's closed because it's a Federal park area, there's an immigration rally that's being supported by the Park Police.

What's happening, Mr. Speaker?

The Grand Canyon, closed. I guess you can't walk up to the rim and look over. The State offered to pay the bill, and the Federal Government said, no, we don't want your money. We want to close it.

Is that reasonable?

I don't know. It's not reasonable to me.

It was The Washington Post that reported employees were to make it as inconvenient as possible.

Now, some are characterized around here as being extreme, an extreme faction. The four bills that we passed to avert the shutdown were passed by this side and that side together, four bipartisan bills.

And they say the House is being held hostage by a few Members. I don't know. Bipartisan votes on both sides seems less than extreme to me.

And I've got to ask, since when are Americans who want to see the government act within the constitutional bounds, that is, the House and the Senate, the Congress figuring out our spending level and our spending priority, when is that extreme?

Why is that extreme?

That's our job. That's the division of powers. That's the checks and balances. That's what we do. That's why we're here.

How is that extreme?

How is spending trillions of dollars more than you have now viewed as responsible?

How is talking about trying to save some money and be responsible with the taxpayers' money on our future, how is that seen as extreme?

Why is it okay to think that spending that money is okay and acceptable to most Americans?

Who gets away with that kind of behavior in their own households?

Well, you do, but not for very long, I guess.

With that I'd like to yield some time, if I could, to the fine gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania.

You were mentioning some of the things that the prior speakers, the Democrats, were saying. And one of the things that was said was, give us a vote, when, as my friend from Pennsylvania pointed out, there have been plenty of votes.

They also were saying that, talking about budget conferees. We're past the end of the fiscal year. The way it's supposed to work, we're supposed to have a budget very early in the year, and then after that, do the appropriations bills.

Well, the Senate has not been doing budgets in the past. This is the first time in years. They haven't done what the law required. They seem to ignore the law anytime they wish.

They have not been passing any appropriations bills. And that's a political game that allows Majority Leader HARRY REID to avoid following the law so that any potential vulnerable Democratic Senators will not have to take tough votes like people do in the House constantly, because we've appropriations bills and we continue to do that.

And so we know, since we passed the military pay bill that required that the military get paid, we treat military pay somewhat like we do Social Security pay, so that if the government were shut down, the military still gets paid. People in harm's way don't have to worry about family members getting their check.

So since my friend across the aisle was so upset about not having a vote, and I realize we get busy here and some people forget the things we've been voting on the last 10 days.

So I'd just like to remind my friends across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that actually, we voted, after we passed a bill to pay our military; and as my friend, Mr. PERRY knows, the Democrats voted for it. The Senate voted for it. The President signed it.

And in the bill, as we spelled out, civilians were supposed to continue employment that were assisting the military. Contractors were supposed to continue working that were supporting the military; and yet this administration had chosen to try to make as many people suffer as possible, even though the law didn't require it.

So the Secretary of Defense sat on his hands for about a week, had civilian personnel not working that could have been working all this time; decides, after a week, to follow the advice, he says, of his people that had been looking at the bill.

And we made clear from the very beginning, before the shutdown even started, you don't have to send all these people home, but he did it anyway.

□ 2130

It was consistent with what has been mentioned that one of the park rangers said, though it was disgusting to the ranger, We were told make things as difficult for people as we can.

And people keep saying we were demanding the total repeal of ObamaCare. Well, we know that would be best for America because a lot of people are already suffering. We've already seen ObamaCare is not being followed as law because the President has had hundreds of exemptions that he

has waved his hand, waved his magic wand and said, You don't have to follow this law; you don't have to follow this law. You don't have to follow what's here in this provision; you don't have to follow what's in this provision. And by the way, the business mandate in the law makes no exceptions. Business folks, my party still wants to get your contributions, so I will wave my wand and you don't follow the law.

So when my friends across the aisle say, Just let ObamaCare go, I would say the same thing. You let ObamaCare go, if the President will, if HARRY REID will. If you just let it be enforced exactly the way it is, it won't last a month.

But he has had to do so many waivers, and it will continue. So it's not going into law. In fact, the Supreme Court had to rewrite it just to uphold it. Because they already said that the basis for the law that was given, the interstate commerce clause, was not a basis to take over health care in America. So they struck it down under the law as written; and the law, as written, said there was a penalty.

Well, the Supreme Court said at page 15 that it's a penalty, and therefore the anti-injunction act does not apply. Therefore, we do have jurisdiction, and so now that we have jurisdiction, we'll go ahead and decide it's not constitutional the way it's written as a penalty, but we will rewrite it, the five of us in the majority, and call it a tax. And then we'll uphold it as a tax, even though clearly that's not the way it was written.

It's not what the President promised the American people. So much for the Democrats wanting ObamaCare to be followed as it was written. We're way beyond that with all the waivers and exemptions.

But then we had a vote that said, Okay, let's just suspend it for a year because everybody knows ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. Clearly. That's why the President had to give business a 1-year exemption, where we just won't follow the law as it's applied to business.

But then, after the Senate refused to even take that up, we did the most reasonable thing that some said they could imagine and that is, Okay, you just waved off the mandatory requirements for business. So if you're going to magically wave off part of the law that's mandatory, then let's agree to do that for everyone, like the person that's making \$15,000, or 133 percent of the poverty level. A year or so ago, we were told that was \$14,000 something. Now it's \$15,000. But even with subsidies, you're probably going to end up paying a few thousand dollar. Somebody making \$15,000 is going to have a few thousands over their subsidies? And if you don't do that, you're going to pay the \$95, or 1 percent of your income, as an extra tax?

People do not have that extra money. People have been sent from full time to part time. When the union members

figured out what the union leaders had done to them, causing many of them to lose full time and going to part-time employment, many of them losing their great health insurance and now they'll have to go under the ObamaCare exchanges, like Members of Congress, they got upset. All of a sudden, the leaders of the unions said, Gee, look at all the unintended consequences.

We knew there were intended consequences. We talked about them at the time.

So that was something that was passed. Just waive the individual mandate for a year. That was not taken up by the Senate. So then we passed what, to me, seemed like a capitulation. We appointed negotiators and said, Okay, you don't like any of those proposals, Mr. Majority Leader HARRY REID, then this is what adults do: we appoint negotiators, and we can probably have a deal done by morning before anybody realizes there's even been a shutdown at midnight.

But Majority Leader REID, following the lead of our President, made clear that they were going to follow the conventional wisdom of the last few years that if there's a shutdown, the mainstream media will clearly blame Republicans, and maybe that will help us politically. So he even refused to negotiate.

So once we saw that HARRY REID had completely refused to even negotiate, pretty reasonable folks that were appointed by Speaker BOEHNER, the majority leader says, We're not going to do that.

It's possible they could have slept through it. Maybe I was given a speech and my Democratic friends dozed off and didn't know we had all these votes. So if they happened to be sleeping while we had these votes, I would like to remind people that then we had a bill that we voted on to provide local funding for the District of Columbia. We know the District of Columbia has a lot of money of its own that comes in.

Frankly, I was shocked that our friends across the aisle—most of them—voted against allowing the District of Columbia to just move forward with its own money so that it could run the operations of the city. Apparently, they wanted to inflict as much harm as possible so that people would continue to blame the Republicans.

We know the mainstream media has long since quit being objective. Twenty-one stories from the mainstream media at first all unanimously blamed Republicans failing to report that HARRY REID would not even appoint negotiators to work something out quickly.

And then we passed the Open Our National Parks and Museums Act. It would have made sure that all of these places that have been shut down by this administration in the most hurtful, harmful, punitive way possible, trying to get everybody in America

they can to hurt some way so that they can blame Republicans, when it's simply the decision of the President.

We answered by saying, Okay, Democrats across the aisle, you want a vote? Let's vote. There's no need to do this, and the response across the aisle was to have most of the Democrats vote to leave them shut. They weren't going to vote with us to fund our national parks.

And then we had a vote on Research for Lifesaving Cures Act, H.J. Res. 73, to provide funding for the National Institutes of Health, which is responsible for lifesaving medical innovation and cancer research. Most, except for about 20 or so Democrats, all voted not to fund the National Institutes of Health.

Our friends across the aisle say, Give us a vote. They got a vote. You want to fund the NIH, then vote to do it. We'll send it down. But even though we passed it and sent it down the Hall, HARRY REID was not going to do it because, as my friend pointed out, when he was asked if you could save one child with cancer, why wouldn't you do that, he said, Why would we do that? And then he chastised the reporter for asking a question which in his mind he thought was a silly question. I thought it was an excellent question.

And then many of us believed there was enough latitude to pay some of our Reservists on Active Duty. But the Defense Department took a narrow interpretation so they could punish more people and blame the Republicans.

So to counter that, we passed a Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act on October 3 that ensured during the shutdown that it would not affect the pay for our National Guard and Reserves. Again, 160 Democrats voted against that. They asked for a vote, we give them a vote. Most of them voted against it. Then our friend, HARRY REID, down the hall said, No way, we're not funding them.

Again, maybe our friends were asleep. Sometimes when I talk, I put people to sleep. It happens. I'm a very restless speaker.

We passed the National Emergency Disaster Recovery Act. That provided immediate funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and 164 of our Democratic friends voted against that, and HARRY REID refuses to bring it up.

We actually brought up a bill to pay our veterans and make sure our wounded warriors were taken care of. The way the rules of the House have been—and are—you can bypass the committee of jurisdiction and go straight to the floor without the committee bringing the bill to the floor, without it being voted out of committee, under what is called a suspension. But to bypass the committee of jurisdiction, it requires a two-thirds vote in the House.

I, like Speaker BOEHNER, thought that surely you could bring the veterans bill to the floor under a suspension because surely they would vote to fund our wounded warriors. Most of us were totally shocked that the vast ma-

jority of Democrats voted against funding our veterans, our wounded warriors.

So we had to go back, have the committee of jurisdiction pass it, bring it to the floor under a rule so a simple majority would pass it. And that's what we did with H.J. Res. 72; and when 157 of our friends across the aisle who wanted a vote, they got a vote. And they voted against funding our wounded warriors.

We also took up the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act that provided immediate funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for women, infants, and children. It serves nearly 9 million mothers and young children and provides vital nutrition that poor families might otherwise be unable to afford.

Then 164 of our Democratic friends voted against that bill, but it passed the House nonetheless. We sent it down to HARRY REID. They have been wanting a vote. We gave them a vote.

On October 5, we voted for the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. It provided for compensation for Federal employees furloughed due to the Senate Democrats' government shutdown. It's similar to the bipartisan legislation enacted during previous shutdowns. We did pass that, but HARRY REID thus far has refused to take that up.

Mr. PERRY. I yield back the balance of my time.

#### VOTING TO END THE SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 18 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much my friend, Mr. PERRY from Pennsylvania, bringing this whole issue forward.

There are a number of more votes that we did take. We took up the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act, providing official education funding to support Head Start programs across the country, and 168 of the Democrats across the aisle voted against that. HARRY REID is refusing to take that up.

My friends across the aisle wanted a vote. So we voted for the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act. It seemed like if HARRY REID would not appoint negotiators before the shutdown really had a chance to take hold, I wasn't sure this was really necessary, but there's a Chinese proverb having to do with allowing your opponent a graceful way out.

□ 2145

So this bill was proposed as a graceful way out so that HARRY REID could come back and say, Okay, well, now we will, under this new bill, we'll go ahead and appoint negotiators and act like it was some new bill when the truth is

it's just us trying to have a bicameral discussion. Yet we had 197 Democrats vote against—well, there were 197 that voted against the bill, basically Democrats, saying we don't want to sit down and work this out with negotiators.

I thought about voting against it because it seemed pretty needless since we already voted to appoint negotiators, conferees. HARRY REID wouldn't do that. But I was persuaded, look, this is a way for HARRY REID to get out gracefully, go ahead and appoint negotiators. Now maybe we can get something worked out.

We also passed the Federal Workers Pay Fairness Act, which ensured all Federal employees who are still on the job during the shutdown will be paid on time. Again, we have not seen that the Democrats in the House have any interest in bringing that to the floor to get a vote.

So my friends across the aisle here in the House who kept screaming, Give us a vote, I hope that will be directed toward their friend, HARRY REID, down the hall, Give a vote to the Senate on these bills. I just can't imagine a majority of the Senate not being willing to fund the things that we have passed.

So, let's see, the term that was used in the prior discussion was "burning the house down," "rigging negotiation." Rigging negotiation? We appointed negotiators. It's not rigged.

Now, it is interesting that the President wishes to have the authority—takes the authority even though he doesn't have it—to just rewrite the entire ObamaCare law. Any part that he decides to wave his hand and dismiss, he's done that. But there are consequences for doing that.

We've also seen in this shutdown something that's just not normally been seen in America. We've seen Franklin Roosevelt say, We have nothing to fear but fear itself. But it's a rare thing—an extremely rare thing—to say that the market needs to be afraid and needs to start getting concerned, trying to gin up a panic to drive down the market. And the market, after a week's time of Republicans having negotiators sitting out there for over a week, waiting to sit down and negotiate with Senators, and the Senators thinking they're winning a political battle, so being unwilling to send negotiators to sit down and work out a deal. Today, between the concerns expressed by the President that the market needs to be concerned, basically saying it needs to start dropping so Republicans will get scared and they will give me everything I want.

So it's interesting they talk across the aisle about holding a gun to the head, burning the house down. The thing is, this is not our House. It's not the Democrats' House; it's the people's House. That's why I try to take people through tours at least once a week when we're in session. This is the people's House, and it breaks my heart that it's so hard to get in here nowadays. It wasn't when I was in high

school, and I would like for it to be more accessible to people.

But burning the house down, the references are so misplaced because it's the Democratic President that says, Give me everything I want. Do not stand in my way when I legislate and rewrite the laws to suit me. We already saw that happen with the GM and Chrysler bailout. The government became socialists for a while here and decided to take up nationalist interests in things—did so with Wall Street.

With the car dealers, it should have scared most Americans. It should have scared Americans enough that they would never, ever have wanted the government to be in control of their health care, because what we saw is mainly Republican dealers were the ones that lost their dealerships. There was no due process. They violated bankruptcy law right and left. And the Supreme Court, Ruth Bader Ginsburg put a 24-hour hold, but then let it lapse. The Supreme Court hung their heads, let illegal actions, unconstitutional actions, takings without due process all take place. And Republican dealers, many of them were punished, had their dealerships taken away even though they still owed money on them. That should have been enough to scare everybody, but we didn't learn a lesson.

Then we find out that after the Citizens United case that the President got upset, stood up here in this Chamber, misrepresented—I know he didn't do it knowingly, but he was not familiar with the law regarding the Citizens United case and misrepresented the law as borne out by the Supreme Court Justice Alito sitting there shaking his head saying "not true." And the President, I'm sure, is just taking advice that's given to him by those around him, not knowing that those who gave him advice were as ignorant as they are.

But when people keep clamoring, Give us a clean CR, when people hear the term "give us a clean CR," they need to understand that this is people demanding that Congress reject the responsibility it has under the Constitution and help crown a monarchy. Let's make it official. We don't want the Congress to do its job and to appropriate as article I requires. We want Congress just to say, Here's the massive sacks of money, Mr. President; go do what you want. Go find all the Solyndras you want. Go find all the cronies that you can help in a capitalist way so that they can overtake their competitors. Go do what you wish. Maybe you can even find some more dealerships to take away without due process.

We hear friends across the aisle say they love to debate elected officials when the fact is during the 4 years the Democrats had the House as a majority and had the Senate, it was the most partisan, closed Congress in the history of this country. There were more closed rules, bills where no amendments were allowed whatsoever. Even

on ObamaCare, we were not allowed input. There was some discussion, but it was made clear our input was not allowed, so nearly half of the country was not misrepresented when had it came to ObamaCare.

And it's really amazing to hear people say that the ObamaCare law was passed by Congress, by both Houses; the President signed it into law; and then of course they misrepresent—I know they don't do it intentionally—but saying the Supreme Court upheld it. Now, the Supreme Court rewrote it and then upheld what they wrote—or at least five out of the nine did. Then the President has completely rewritten anything he doesn't like, given waivers, exemptions. So it's not the law that got passed.

And it's amazing to hear people say, gee, once a law is passed and the President has signed it, you can't change it. It's the law; get over it. And almost in the same breath come back and say, now the debt ceiling—parenthetically, which was passed by both Houses, signed by President Obama and is upheld by the Supreme Court—we want to change that immediately, do that now; don't use it as a gun to our head. What do you mean a gun to your head? It's the law. You just told us if it's passed by Congress, signed by the President—the President himself said it bears my signature, we're not changing it. So why would that be a gun to the head when I thought the President said we weren't supposed to talk metaphorically like that. We weren't supposed to use violent metaphors. Why are we talking like that? Why are we calling people arsonists when we're just trying to follow the Constitution? But again, that's consistent with Homeland Security saying that those who believe in the Constitution are extremists, and they must be watched at all cost.

I think my friends are right when they say go to the American people. The trouble is the mainstream media has not done that. They have actually stood in the way of the truth getting to the American people. They're not asking questions as my friend had asked Andrea Mitchell today, Why are you not asking why the President is not under ObamaCare? She says, well, why aren't you under it? Well, we are on it.

There was an issue about subsidies. I'm not going to take them, not when other Americans don't get them the way they used to. But, gee, let's be honest about things. Well, The Wall Street Journal says that Maryland has 326 enrollees in their health exchange—got an article here talking about there. "ObamaCare's Winners and Losers in Bay Area," an article from Mercury News that talks about:

Cindy Vinson and Tom Waschura are big believers in the Affordable Care Act. They vote independent and are proud to say they helped elect and re-elect President Barack Obama. Yet, like many other Bay residents who pay for their own medical insurance, they were floored last week when they opened their bills: their policies were being

replaced with pricier plans that conform to all the requirements of the new health care law.

Vinson, of San Jose, will pay \$1,800 more a year for an individual policy, while Waschura, of Portola Valley, will cough up almost \$10,000 more for insurance for his family of four.

"Welcome to the club", said Robert Laszewski, a prominent health care consultant and president of Health Policy and Strategy Associates in Virginia.

For years, the Nation has been embroiled in the political rhetoric of "ObamaCare," but this past week the reality of the new law sank in as millions of Americans had their first good look at how the 3½-year-old legislation will affect their pocketbooks.

It's a disaster. So when my friends on the other side of the aisle say, well, let's just let it fully take effect, we've already seen what happens, this President and HARRY REID are not going to let the full thing take effect.

We've seen the way the IRS, with instructions from somebody around the White House—if not in it, we're still trying to get to the bottom of it—was instructed to go after conservative groups. And they did. The IRS was weaponized.

We've seen what's happened with other groups. They're paying a price. And you want these people to control your health care? You want them to decide whether you get a knee replacement or a hip replacement?

"Beyond the glitches: Will young and healthy Americans pick up ObamaCare?" is an article, October 7, that talks about one of the most heated arguments among health care policy writers has revolved around the issue of rate shock, which is a term for the premium increases many Americans—especially younger, healthier ones—will experience once the law kicks in. It's just going to get worse.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say they want a vote. They've been getting votes. They will continue to get votes. We just ask them to join us in demanding that HARRY REID bring these bills to the floor for a vote. And let's get them passed so these things will be taken care of.

And in answer to his question: Why would we do that? The answer is: To help America. It's that simple. Mr. REID needs to bring these bills to the floor in the Senate; and if you're not going to bring the bills to the floor, for heavens sakes appoint negotiators so we can get America moving before any more punitive shutdowns by this administration occur just to punish the American people because of the temper tantrum being thrown by those who want their way or nobody gets to play.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 3, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3233. To extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, also reported that on October 7, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3095. To ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 9, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3251. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0941; FRL-9398-7] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3252. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Styrene, Copolymers with Acrylic Acid and/or Methacrylic Acid; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0381; FRL-9396-9] received September 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3253. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tuba City, AZ [Docket FAA No.: FAA-2013-0147; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-1] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3254. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Waco, TX, and Establishment of Class D Airspace; Waco, TSTC-Waco Airport, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0136; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-4] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3255. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Columbus, Rickenbacker International Airport, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0270; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-4] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3256. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Grand Forks AFB, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0261; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-14] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3257. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Spata, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0165; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-6] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3258. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; San Marcos, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0273; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASW-9] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3259. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bedford, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0359; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-7] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3260. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Factoryville, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0345; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-6] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: House Committee on Rules. House Resolution 373. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-243). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 3273. A bill to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth; to the Committees on Rules and Appropriations; considered and passed.

By Mr. BARBER (for himself, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LONG, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr.

GALLEGO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3274. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to make appropriations available to continue the payment of a death gratuity and certain other death-related compensation in the event of the death of members of the Armed Forces and certain other persons who pass away during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to ensure that the allowances of members of the Armed Forces covered by such Act include military tuition assistance programs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 3276. A bill to prohibit the operation of an exercise facility for Members of the House of Representatives during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3277. A bill to prohibit United States voluntary contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations or any United Nations agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3278. A bill to amend chapter 77 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify certain due process rights of Federal employees serving in sensitive positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 89. A joint resolution making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations; considered and passed.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 90. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LONG, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.J. Res. 91. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. BARR):

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Environmental Protection Agency should hold

public listening sessions on regulations targeting carbon dioxide emissions from existing power plants in those States most directly impacted by the potential regulations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. SABLAN):

H. Res. 374. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to file, sign, and call up discharge petitions; to the Committee on Rules.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 3273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2, Section 5, Article I of the Constitution (Permitting each House to determine the Rules of its Proceedings).

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 3274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, To raise and support armies

Article 1, Section 8, To provide and maintain a navy

By Mrs. BLACKBURN

H.R. 3275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 3276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 89.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

(the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 90.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 91.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 75: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 269: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 366: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 580: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 647: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. HAHN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 713: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 724: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. PETERS of California, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 725: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 784: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 846: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 920: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1000: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1005: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1010: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 1024: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1039: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1074: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 1179: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1293: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1295: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1553: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1652: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1726: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1734: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1750: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1755: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1830: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1971: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2020: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2199: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2208: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2213: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. GALLEGUE.

H.R. 2224: Mr. HIMES and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2305: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2315: Mr. LANCE and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2328: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2376: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2429: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2500: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2510: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2547: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 2643: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2682: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2697: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2725: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2734: Mr. TONKO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2767: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 2856: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2870: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2901: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2920: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2974: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2999: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3043: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 3077: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. SIRE.

H.R. 3108: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3111: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PERRY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 3112: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3116: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 3121: Mr. HARPER and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3133: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANFORD, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3134: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 3142: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3160: Mr. DAINES and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 3207: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD and Mr. FOSTER.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 147: Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 153: Mr. RADEL.

H. Res. 227: Ms. TSONGAS.

H. Res. 231: Mr. HIMES and Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Res. 281: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. RADEL.

### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks,



limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in H.R. 3273 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY  
H.J. Res. 89, the Excepted Employees' Pay Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY  
H.J. Res. 90, the Flight Safety Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks,

limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 91, the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.